







Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

A. T. Anderson

Sept. 15-94

THE MASTER'S COLLEGE
POWELL LIBRARY
SANTA CLARITA CA 91331

221.61
F816.0

OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES:

AN OUTLINE OF

Old Testament Theology.

BY

R. V. FOSTER, D. D.,

AUTHOR OF INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THEOLOGY, AND
PROFESSOR IN THE CUMBERLAND UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL
SCHOOL, LEBANON, TENN.

:: Fleming D. Revell ::

CHICAGO:
148 and 150 Madison Street.

NEW YORK:
12 Bible House, Astor Place.

:: Publisher of Evangelical Literature ::

THE MASTER'S COLLEGE
POWELL LIBRARY
SANTA CLARITA, CA 91355

PROPERTY OF LIBRARY
MORTENSON COLLEGIATE BIBLE INSTITUTE

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1890, by
FLEMING H. REVELL,

In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES.

P R E F A C E.

THE BIBLE is a many-sided book, and it should be read and studied from many points of view. The truths which were conveyed through the centuries to God's ancient people, and which through them were intended to be conveyed to us, must be thoroughly and rightly grasped before they can be safely applied. This book is the brief development of a plan of Old Testament study which I have pursued for several years, and with great profit to myself. If any Bible student who has not already done so, should develop for himself this or some similar topical plan, neither could he fail to find it very beneficial, especially if it should be done in that spirit which should always characterize our study of the Word of God.

The Old and New Testaments are to us revelations from God; but when we study them, as we should, among other ways, as the record of a long series of revelations which God made to his ancient people, the Old Testament, both logically and chronologically, comes first. It would not be in the least degree wise for the church, either in the Sunday School or elsewhere, to deprecate the value of the Old Testament. One of the strongest pillars of the New Testament Church is furnished in the evidential value of that relation which the Old bears to the New.

The course of thought in these pages has not brought me into direct contact with the literary problems of the Old Testament, which might necessarily make the larger part of some plans of study. The theories concerning the origin and composition of the various books I have not discussed, but when necessary have assumed such ground in regard to these matters as seemed to me best.

The Old Testament itself has of course been my chief source; and yet I have read all the foreign and American books and magazine articles on the subjects that were available to me. To them I have sought to give due credit at the proper places, in so far as I may have quoted them; and I cannot say that any one author has been more helpful than all the others.

The best wish that I can express in publishing this Outline is that the course of Old Testament study may prove to be as engaging and as profitable to the readers for whom it is chiefly intended as it has been to me, and that after a while we may find the similar study of the New Testament equally so.

R. V. F.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

1. Biblical Theology.....	11
2. Revelation	27
3. Relation of the Old and New Testaments to each other..	35

OLD TESTAMENT STUDY.

Its Scope.....	47
----------------	----

DIVISION I.—THE PRE-MOSAIC PERIOD.

CHAPTER I.

Historical; or, The Principal Facts of this Period.....	51
§1. The Creation.....	52
§2. The Primal Abode and Fall of Man.....	59
§3. The Noachic Deluge.....	63
§4. The Dispersion of the Nations	69
§5. Abraham Before his Call	79

CHAPTER II.

THE PRE-MOSAIC THEOLOGY AND RELIGION.

§1. Theology and Worship of the Antedeluvians.	81
§2. The Patriarchal Theology and Religion.....	88
I. Outside of the Sphere of Revelation.....	88
II. Within the Sphere of Revelation.....	91

DIVISION II.—THE MOSAIC PERIOD.

Definition of Mosaism.....	104
----------------------------	-----

CHAPTER I.

HISTORICAL AND DOCTRINAL BASIS OF MOSAISM.

§1. Historical Basis.....	104
§2. Historical Basis Continued—Moses.....	108
§3. Doctrinal Basis.....	113

CHAPTER II.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF GOD.

§1. The Name "Jehovah".....	123
§2. God as the Only One.....	128
§3. God as Invisible and Spiritual.....	133
§4. God as the Holy One.....	135
§5. Attributes implied in Holiness.....	138
§6. God as Creator and Sovereign.....	141
§7. God's Revelation of Himself to Man.....	146

CHAPTER III.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF MAN.

Definition	153
A. Man as Originally Created:	
§1. His Origin	154
§2. Man in his Sexual Aspects.....	156
§3. In his Racial Aspects.....	159
§4. "In the Image of God"	
§5. The Names Adam and Ish	166
§6. Body, Soul, Spirit	170
B. Man as Affected by Sin:	
§1. The Probation and Fall.....	175
§2. Sin	183
§3. Death.....	187
§4. After Death.....	189

CHAPTER IV.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

A. The Kingdom in its Central Idea:	
§1. Definition	195
§2. Initial Promises	198
1. The Protevangelium, Gen. iii, 15.	
2. The Blessing of Shem, Gen. ix.	
3. The Blessing of Abraham, Gen. xii, 1-3, etc.	
4. The Blessing on the Twelve Patriarchs, Gen. xl ix.	
§3. The Redemptive Calling of Israel	207
§4. The Obligations and Penalties Implied.....	211
B. The Kingdom of God as Organized Israel:	
§1. The Theocratic Character of the Government.....	214
§2. The Mosaic Constitutional Law.....	218

§3. The Mosaic Civil Law.....	223
1. Concerning Parent and Child.	
2. Concerning Marriages.	
3. Concerning Master and Slave.	
4. Concerning Foreigners.	
5. Land and other Property.	
6. Debts, Loans, Interest.	
7. Tax Laws.	
§4. The Criminal Code	233
§5. The Ecclesiastical and Ceremonial Code.....	236
1. The Tabernacle.	
2. The Priests and Levites.	
3. Concerning Offerings.	
4. Laws intended to implant the idea of holiness.	
C. The Typical and Prophetical Aspects of the Kingdom.	
§1. The Mosaic "Types".....	241
§2. The Star of Balaam.....	250
§3. The Prophet Promised.....	255

DIVISION III.

PERIOD OF THE PROPHETS.

Definition	
------------------	--

CHAPTER I.

PROPHETISM HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

§1. Civil and Religious Characteristics of this Period.....	261
§2. The Rise of the Prophetical Order.....	266
§3. Periods of Biblical Prophecy.....	272

CHAPTER II.

NATURES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF PROPHECY.

§1. The Prophetic Gift.....	275
§2. Hebrew Prophets and Heathen Mantism.....	278
§3. Prophecy and the Natural Shemitic Genius.....	283
§4. The Predictive Element in Prophecy.....	285
§5. Characteristics of Prophecy.....	
§6. Forms of Prophecy.....	296

CHAPTER III.

DOCTRINAL CONTENTS OF DAVIDIC PROPHECY.

A.

THE PREDICTIVE, OR OBJECTIVE, ELEMENT.

<i>The Central Thought</i>	299
§1. The Covenant with David	301
§2. The Messiah in the Typical and Typico-Prophetic Psalms	305

B.

THE MEDITATIVE, OR SUBJECTIVE, ELEMENT.

Characteristics:

§1. The Davidic Theology (Doctrine of God)	313
§2. The Davidic Doctrine Concerning the Moral and Ceremonial Law	318
§3. Retribution	322
§4. The Future Life	324
§5. The Inequalities of Human Life	328

CHAPTER IV.

THE DOCTRINAL CONTENTS OF POST-DAVIDIC PROPHECY.

<i>General Remark</i>	342
§1. The Idea of God in the Prophets	344
§2. Man's Relation to God	348
§3. The Messiah in the Prophets	352
§4. The Future	356
§5. Individual Resurrection	361
§6. Old Testament Doctrine of Angels	363
Index	367

INTRODUCTION.

I.—BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

1. *General Remark.*

There is a vast amount of popular ignorance in regard to the Bible, and yet it is also true that no book is more universally read or studied than it is.

There are many right ways of studying the Bible, and no way is the best to the exclusion of all other methods. The Bible is a many-sided book, and he who restricts his gaze to one side can never see it all. It tells us a great many things, and he who reads it simply in general can not know much about it. The jurist, for example, does not read the constitution of the State merely in a general way; he reads it much and carefully, in order that he may ascertain its bearings on the particular statute or other matter which he may have in hand from time to time.

Nor do we like to read or study a book without knowing its title. We like to know in advance what it is about, and so natural and proper is this desire that we could scarcely be induced, ordinarily, to buy a book whose title-page is gone. The title of the Bible is not “THE BIBLE,” for that expression means simply “the book.” If the Bible had a title-page, what would it be? for the Bible is evidently one book, and it evi-

dently has one paramount object in view. I should think if the reader would ascertain what this paramount object is he would then have discovered what to many is the lost title-page of the Bible. Some books have two titles, a short one and a longer one. Now, it would seem that the title of the Bible might be correctly stated thus: "The History of Human Redemption; or, The History of God's Purpose to Redeem Man, and of His Dealings with the Race to that End." And I think that if we were to study every part of the Bible with this fundamental idea of redemption in our minds it would seem to us to be a more interesting and intelligible book than it could otherwise be. Nor is it a difficult matter to so express the titles or central thoughts of the several books of the Bible as to readily see the natural relation in which they stand to the title of the whole. Thus, in its relation to this redemptive idea which gives us the title for the whole Bible, the title of the book of Genesis may be regarded as "The Seed of the Woman Bruising the Serpent's Head," for it is a great mistake to suppose that the serpent's head did not begin to be bruised until Christ came in the flesh. The bruising began at once, and was kept up through the centuries, and will be kept up until he and his seed are overthrown. The object, then, of the inspired writer of Genesis in recording the account of the creation and the fall was that he might make an intelligible and orderly approach to his subject, which appears in iii:15. The chapters and books which follow on to the end are the history of the development and fulfillment of this promise, moving in line with the development of the human race, and chiefly the Israelitish branch of it.

From this point of view it is easily seen also that the title of the book of Exodus is "The Messianic, or Redemptive, Calling of Israel" to that special work of receiving and taking care of that truth whereby God would redeem man. In like manner the title of Leviticus is "The Outward Means, Conditions, Agencies, and Occasions of Reconciliation with Him." And in general, if we wish, from this point of view, to know what the title of any book in the Bible is, we have only to ascertain in what relation it stands to the above-mentioned title of the whole, and in no case will this be difficult to do.

It is not my purpose, however, to discuss here the various methods of Bible study, some of which are excellent, while others are more or less faulty; some superficial and easy, others more difficult, but also more fruitful of good results. It is my purpose to discuss briefly one of the methods or sciences—for it may also be called a science—known as biblical theology, a name which ought not to be offensive even to the common reader, for what is biblical theology but, to state it in general terms, the orderly presentation of the teachings of the Bible concerning God and his purpose and plan of redemption?

2. Definition and Scope.

The term "biblical" is in this connection used in a kind of technical sense, whereby it is not meant to be implied, of course, that the ordinarily so-called systematic theology is not in another sense quite biblical. Systematic theology, however, is constructed in reference to the state of Christian thought and affairs at the time of the writer, and is bound to take more or less formal heed to the voice of the Church as expressed in

creeds and rulings of ecclesiastical councils. But biblical theology as such has nothing to do with creeds as such, nor with the present, only in so far as its form may to a greater or less extent be determined thereby. It seeks the truth of revelation, not so much in its adaptation to the wants and phases of the Church at the present time, as in its adaptation to the ancient people of God, to whom it was revealed in the first place.

A systematic theology or Christian dogmatics there must be, of course, but it is only a systematic exposition of the creed and the voice of the Church, founded, in the view of the writer, on the sacred Scriptures. But, whatever may be the prepossessions of the writer of a biblical theology, this branch of theological science itself is supposed to deal only with the Bible, unhampered by allegiance to any other confession. It builds on the postulate of a central thought in the whole Old and New Testament revelation, viz.: the divine purpose of redemption, and it seeks to trace within the period of the biblical history the movement of that purpose toward its consummation. God spake unto the fathers "by divers portions and in divers manners" (Heb. i:1), and the object of biblical theology is to systematically exhibit and discuss this revelation of God as it was actually made from time to time.

But God revealed his will and purpose not only by means of the words which he spake through prophets and apostles, but also by means of the facts or historical occurrences recorded in the Bible. Biblical theology, then, is the historical exhibition of the religion in its entirety, including doctrines, worship, and events, as set forth in the canonical books of the sacred Scrip-

tures. It conducts its discussion apart from any confessional standpoint, though the results of its inquiries may, of course, be quite in harmony with the creed in so far as the latter may express itself. It abides mainly in the Bible times, seeking to know the course, and the contents, and the significance of God's revelation to his ancient people primarily in its relation to that people themselves. This must be first known before its relation to the subsequent Church can be fully apprehended and appreciated. Only thus can the fundamental importance of the Old Testament in its relation to the New, and hence to ourselves, be made clearly visible.

Biblical theology, then, would seem to be easily distinguishable from what is commonly called Systematic theology or Christian dogmatics. The latter has a by no means unimportant place in theological science and literature, but it can not, and it should not, lose sight wholly of the Confession and of the aspects and demands of the organized Church and the times. Biblical theology is systematic, but it is not "Systematic;" and, on the other hand, Systematic theology ought to be in harmony with the teachings of the Bible, but it is not "Biblical" in the proper technical sense in which the word is used.

3. Method.

That is, upon what principle or plan is biblical theology constructed? Its method is historical. It seeks to reproduce or exhibit the process whereby religious knowledge attained its growth, as found in the Bible, using the books of the Bible for this purpose according to their presumed chronological order. It shows how religious knowledge was added from time to time to what was already in the possession of God's people or

had been previously revealed. It shows the laws of the development of the biblical religion from the germinal principles in the beginning to the completion of the revalation in the Christ of the New Testament. But the growth or development which biblical theology traces is a supernatural growth. It is not possible to explain it on merely natural grounds, and hence it can by no means be regarded as the mere outcome of the striving of the so-called religious genius of the Hebrew people.

But biblical theology is also inductive in its method, because it is based on biblical facts, and ever seeks the unity which exists in the abundant diversity of biblical times, authors, types of doctrine, etc., and, by comparing one with another, reaches its conclusions. It examines the statements or passages severally and together, treating the biblical revelation as embodied in divine deeds and institutions, as well as in words or verbal statements of doctrine and precept. In short, it embraces all the essential factors of the history of the kingdom of God as set forth in the Old and New Testaments.

4. Sources.

The primary sources of biblical theology are, of course, the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Protestantism rejects both the Jewish and Christian apocryphal writings, while the Roman Catholic Chnrch retains the former, attaching to them a secondary authority. Other sources of information, such as contemporaneous secular history and the religious records of peoples lying outside of the sphere of revelation, are to be consulted by way of collateral illustration. The biblical religion is one among a great

variety of religions, all of which possess a greater or less number of features in common, as, for example, the recognition of the existence of a Divine Being to whom man is in some way responsible. But a true biblical theology recognizes the religion of the Bible as a supernaturally revealed religion, and as being the only one that is so revealed. And it is its province not only to ascertain, systematize, and discuss the contents of this religion, but also to distinguish what is peculiar to it from what it has in common with other religions.

But while the Old Testament is the chief source of the data and subject matter of Old Testament theology, it is necessary for us to have a right view of the Old Testament itself. It is not to be regarded merely as the record left to us of the religious views and practices of the ancient Hebrews, in the same sense as the Zendavesta may be regarded as the record of the religion of the ancient Persians. The ancient Hebrews did and believed many things which the Old Testament did not allow, and it required from the very outset more than one belief and practice which they were extremely slow to accept—which was, indeed, directly opposed to the persistent national tendency. This is an obvious fact, and it helps to prove that the Old Testament religion was by no means the mere outcome, as some rationalists have affirmed, of the simple gift and fondness of the Shemitic people for religious matters.

It is the province, therefore, of a true biblical theology to distinguish not only between the religion of the Old Testament and that of heathen nations, but also between the natural religion of the masses of the Hebrew people and that which was furnished to them,

and through them to us, from above and in a supernatural manner.

So, also, the revelation of the New Testament is to be distinguished from the contemporary uninspired Jewish theology in the midst of which the New Testament form of religion was developed. But a thorough understanding, in so far as this may be possible, of that which lies immediately on the outside of the sphere of revelation will enable us only the more clearly to perceive and appreciate the peculiar excellency of that which is within. Such works, therefore, as throw light on these outside but immediately adjacent matters are to be regarded as useful collateral sources of information, as, for example, Rawlinson's "The Religions of the Ancient World," Lenormant's "Occult Sciences of Asia," Krehl's "Religion of the Pre Islam Arabs," Mover's "The Phenicians," Renouf's "History of the Egyptian Religion," Weber's "System of the Old Synagogue Palestinian Theology," Shuerer's "Jewish People in the Time of Christ, such parts of the Talmuds and Targums as have been made accessible, the "Sacred Books of the East," edited by Professor Max Mueller; in short, the whole of contemporary history, whether within or immediately without the sphere of revelation.

5. History.

Biblical theology, as do all other branches of study, has a history; and neither as a science nor as a method of biblical study can its present state and its present claims be known unless its history is also known. As an independent branch of the theological discipline biblical theology is a modern science, and its growth, like that of the physical sciences, has been gradual, and like

them it has not yet reached perfection. No works were written on this subject, strictly so called, by the early Christian fathers, nor does the Bible seem to have been studied by them according to any method which biblical theology employs. The early fathers resorted largely to the inspired writings both for their opinions and for the proofs of them. By the later fathers, however, the writings of the earlier fathers and philosophers began to be much quoted, a tendency which becomes very apparent in the sixth century, until finally Christian theology became almost exclusively speculative and mystical, the rulings of popes and councils becoming in all cases the rule of faith, and the Bible virtually a dead letter. It being universally taken for granted that the voice of the Church was in all things the voice of God, or, in other words, in harmony with the Bible, of course there could be no such thing as biblical theology in the strict sense, much less in the scientific sense which recognizes it as a distinct organism. The theologians for the most part spent their time either in dreaming mystic dreams or in seeking rational explanations and proofs of certain doctrines which in the very nature of the case admitted of no rational explanation, but were purely and solely matters of revelation.

But the revival of learning, particularly the study of Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, which began in Germany about the middle of the fifteenth century, soon prepared the way for the close exegetical study of the Scriptures without which the great Reformation of the sixteenth century would have been impossible. Roger Bacon, indeed, long before this revival of learning (1291), was well acquainted with the Hebrew and

Greek, and exercised a lasting influence in favor of the study of the original languages of the Bible. But he was not distinctly a Scriptural interpreter, and still less a writer of theology from the strictly biblical point of view.

To Nicholas Lyra, however, who died in 1340, belongs the honor of being the first Scriptural exegete who employed in his studies the original languages. He wrote a commentary on the whole Bible, in which he sought, first of all, the literal sense—a fact the more worthy of mention because, *first*, it was by no means the custom in those days for those who wrote on the Scriptures to seek after the literal sense; *second*, because it was plainly impossible to have a biblical theology without first having a biblical exegesis based upon a thorough study of the literal sense, for biblical theology is to a great extent simply an orderly arrangement and discussion of the results of biblical exegesis; and *third*, because Luther, who may be called the father of the Reformation—theological exegesis, made such use of the hints which Lyra's work offered him that the Roman Catholic pun, "If Lyra had not lyred, Luther had not danced," has become an oft-quoted saying. In a certain important sense it is true that if there had been no Lyra there could have been no Luther. The close exegetical study of our English Scriptures may be regarded by some as dry and impractical, and the similar study of the original Scriptures may be regarded by some as even more so, but it has been a very blessed thing for the Church and the world that Luther and many others did not think so.

But while Luther contributed much to the super-

structure, rather to John Reuchlin and Erasmus belongs the honor of laying the exegetical foundation of biblical theology. They were the “eyes of Germany,” the former contributing more to facilitate the study of the Old Testament in the Hebrew than any man of his day, while the latter was not less influential in the department of New Testament Greek study, thus contributing largely, and perhaps unwittingly, to the release of the scholarship and religion of the day from the shackles of scholasticism and the spirit of speculation. The birth, not only of a more biblical theology, but of biblical theology as a distinct branch of theological science, could be only a matter of time. But it could develop nowhere but on the soil of Protestantism, and it could scarcely have failed to develop there.

But the new-found freedom and facility of Bible study, secured by the Reformation, was abused; it being hardly less difficult in the Church than in the State to preserve the true mean between license and tyranny. This very abuse, however, became the third step in the growth of biblical theology. The Bible was studied more diligently during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries than it had been for a thousand years; but in the estimation of many it came during these two centuries to be studied as a mere store-house of proof-texts, ministering mainly to the polemics of ecclesiastical creeds.

The Bible was the book in which each his dogma sought,
The Bible was the book in which each his dogma found.

The unity of the Scriptures was to a great extent lost sight of. The Bible was studied, not as a whole, but here and there in those places where it was supposed to teach the preconceived opinion. The Bible is the

only rule of faith, the only authority above conscience. As rules of doctrine held in due subordination to the Bible, creeds are of great value and use; and the theologians who gave to the world the great creeds of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries rendered a service which no one can despise. But men were no longer as loyal to the voice of the Church as they had been, and hence the polemical dogmatism of the times naturally resulted in a two-fold reaction, Pietism on the one hand, Rationalism on the other. The influence of the one, at first especially, was wholesome; that of the other, never so, except indirectly. The originators of Pietism were John Coccejus, a Dutch theologian who died in 1669, and Philip James Spener, who established what he called a school of Biblical Theology in Halle in 1694. The former was professor at Leyden, and did much to free the Reformed Church from the tyranny of scholasticism, and taught her to give heed to her true character and work as emphatically a Bible church. His system of the covenants, as set forth in one of his principal books (1648) was the first attempt at constructing a system of biblical theology. Nor was it a mere accidental and unintelligent attempt. He purposely arranged his system under the biblical categories, or heads, and purposely built it on an orderly study of the Bible as a whole. In all these respects he occupied substantially the same ground as the Pietists. He was, however, a firm supporter of the mechanical theory of inspiration, and represented the whole Old Testament as a mirror in which we may have an accurate view of the events which were to happen under the New Testament dispensation to the end of the world—a theory which would not now be regarded as satisfactory even by the most conservative thinkers.

Spener was also penetrated with a conviction that the theological method of that age did not meet the demands or wants of the Church, and that it was not suited to form good preachers and teachers of religion. He therefore recommended banishing the various subtle inquiries, and the polemical mode of treating theological questions, and urged in place of these a purely biblical and practical statement of the doctrines of faith. He was a devoted Lutheran, and duly appreciated the value of the creed, but he labored strenuously, and not without effect, to vindicate the importance and authority of the Bible as our rule of faith over the creed and the outcome of a mere philosophical course of reasoning. He recognized, as every student of the Bible must do, that that which is logical is not always that which is biblical or theological.

A. H. Francke was the contemporary and fellow-laborer of Spener. He urged the young men of his day to acquire a thorough mastery of the fundamental helps in Bible study, particularly the languages, and he illustrated the value of such knowledge in his own evangelical and biblical work, for he was himself a master. But he also insisted that the knowledge of such helps was only a means to a higher end, which is the right understanding of the *subject-matter* of God's word, and that to this end we should industriously supplicate God for the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit. Could Pietism have remained thus, it would have been well for biblical theology; and I know of the biographies of no German evangelical workers and scholars which might be read with more edification by the student of to-day, than the biographies of Spener and Francke. But their method of dealing with the

Bible degenerated in the hands of their followers, becoming to too great an extent allegorical and mystical, confounding the true explication and use of the Scriptures with mere application and suggestion. It should be borne in mind that we cannot know what the Scriptures as a whole, or any given passage, means for us, unless we know in advance what it meant or was intended to mean for those for whom it was written in the first place.

The other reaction was Rationalism; and so radical and permanent has its influence been upon biblical theology that it can not pass unmentioned even in brief sketch of the history of Bible study. As the tyranny of Roman Catholicism has produced its sons of evil, so Rationalism is the wayward offspring of the freedom of Protestantism. It originated largely with J. S. Semler, who died an old man at Halle in 1791. He says of himself: "I certainly would not make our poor little reason the mistress of our faith"—that is to say, there are certain revealed facts which I surely would not reject merely because my reason can not understand or explain them. But he sowed baleful seeds which grew only too rapidly and luxuriantly. Van Oosterzee calls him the leader of the German Neological school, and a representative rationalist. He had many followers in his own land, and the winds have blown the seeds over the seas.

But rationalism was met on the other hand by a vigorous supernaturalism in the writings of such men as Storr, the Flatts, Steudel, Knapp, Hengstenberg, Neander, Tholuck, Schleiermacher, Harms, and others of more recent date. It is not necessary to give the list of books here which have been written by representa-

tives of the two schools respectively, and which lie more or less nearly in the line of works in biblical theology. The number of systematic treatises by English and American scholars is very limited, though not a few excellent monographs have been produced, and the list is rather rapidly increasing.

While the rationalistic school, since the days of Semler, has contributed much to biblical study, and to the development of biblical theology, it has caused the supernaturalistic to contribute perhaps even more. Rationalism in the hands of some of its representatives rejects miracles and prophecy and the whole divine element of the Scriptures, and of course its biblical theology is influenced, and its method formed, accordingly. Supernaturalism affirms the presence of the divine element, and emphasizes it, and maintains that that which is not explainable by human reason is not, therefore, to be regarded as contrary to human reason. The human mind could not reason its way to all that was needful to be known, and hence a Bible, written or unwritten, and supernatural in some of its aspects, was necessary. The Bible does not speculate. It says what it has to say in a concrete and practical manner, stating its facts and its doctrines as matters to be believed rather than to be justified in every instance by our processes of reasoning. Young and immature students should read works of the rationalistic school with great caution. No intensity of rationalism can ever kill the truth, but it may kill the young man.

6. Dangers.

Biblical theology is the offspring of Protestantism, and in no other than the free and fertile soil of Protestantism can it ever flourish. The history of its origin

and rise to a distinct place as a recognized branch of theological science is not the least interesting chapter in the internal history of the modern Church. But while Protestant freedom and activity have given to the world this and many other phases of biblical and theological study, would it not be well for Protestants themselves to hold ever vividly in mind the fact that liberty is not license? The Church, by which we mean the Protestant branch of it, still has a rightful voice, as indeed it must ever have. He who works within the pale of the Church, and under its auspices, necessarily in so doing surrenders a part of his freedom to the Church. If Protestantism should ever degenerate into an excessive individualism, then may be justified the often repeated accusation of our Roman Catholic friends that Protestantism is nothing but "a rushing into a bottomless pit" of negations, discords, and confusions. Nothing is so harmless as the pure truth, nothing is so valuable, nothing more desirable; and many truths are at the bottom of a deep well, their luster so dimmed that they can not be easily identified. But there is nothing hid save that it should be manifested; neither was any thing made secret but that it should come to light. And yet it is also true that it would be a sad day for the Church, and hence for the world, if Protestantism, in its bounding freedom and eagerness to unveil the truth, should swing loose from all its historical landmarks, and the word "traditional" should become only a term of reproach, and we should no more have respect for the gray hairs of the once mighty Past. *In medias res tutissimus ibis.* The middle way is the safest; and if Protestant biblical study, whether in its narrower or more comprehensive sense, would achieve

its best results for the Church and the world, in this way it must walk. Nothing should be labeled "Truth" until it is known to be truth; and nothing that has long, and apparently on good grounds been received as true should be labeled as false until it is known to be so. He who walks in the presence of mystery should walk cautiously, and he who stands in the vicinity of the Cross should do so with bowed and uncov-ered head. These are no places for other than rever-ent and circumspect utterances.

Of the various branches of Christian theology, bibli-
cal theology in one or more of its chapters and aspects
is attracting, perhaps, the most attention at the pres-
ent time; and its investigation, if pursued in the spirit
of honest inquiry and reverential recognition of the
Holy Scriptures as the word of God, is destined to
produce the best results. Theologically our age, hap-
pily, is irenical, Bible searching in catholicity of spirit
being its prominent characteristic. God grant that it
may ever be so; and yet may he also grant that men
may ever reverently regard the Bible as the book
which not only *contains* his word, but which in a cer-
tain true and important sense *is* his word.

II.—REVELATION.

By this is meant God's making himself known to man. In its general sense the term has no reference to the written word of God. There were many revela-tions before there was a Book, though the Book also is to us a revelation. God has made to man two classes of revelations: the one in nature and the other

the record of which we have in the Bible. In what respects do the two differ? What characteristics has the latter which the former has not? The questions are of fundamental importance. If we deny that there is any essential difference between the two, biblical theology is reduced to the level of natural theology, and is, moreover, thoroughly rationalistic. There is no longer any appeal to faith, but only to reason and fear. In so far as the two revelations cover the same ground, they are in harmony with each other. On one, or both, rests all the knowledge which man has of God, his inferences being based on what is revealed. Without at least a natural revelation, there could be no religion whatever. All heathen religions, even, without exception, proceed on the supposition of a revelation of some sort. All revelations, whether "natural" or biblical, are in some sense supernatural. It is God who makes the revelation, and God is above nature. And all revelations are in some sense "natural;" they are all made to man and in harmony with the natural laws of his being. The faculty in man to which appeal is made in both cases is his faith, or religious consciousness; if this faculty be vitiated, the revelation is only so far the less a revelation to him, whatever it may be in itself. "If the light in him be darkness, how great is that darkness." The difference between the two revelations is best seen by a parallel description and exhibit of their characteristics.

First. The natural revelation. This may be considered under several aspects:

(1) The original revelation of Himself which God has made to all men in the very constitution of the spirit breathed into him in his creation. In the absence

of any higher revelation, man's own moral nature supplies to some extent its place. This moral faculty, which is itself a revelation, is born with every man, everywhere, and in every age, however much or little it may afterwards be developed by another revelation. It is to him a "conscience" which both enables him to know good and evil, and condemns the one and approves the other. (Rom. ii.: 14, 15.) The heart of every man, whether with or without the Bible, is a judgment hall, where witnesses are heard for and against him, and where the sentence of the judge is pronounced. The retributive element, based upon this natural revelation of obligation to a Supreme Being, and the consequent distinction between right and wrong, is present in all religions. The heathen poet Sophocles, speaks of the unwritten and indelible law, or revelation, of the gods in the hearts of men, and contrasts this internal and divine legislation, which is eternal, with the ever-changing laws of man; and Plutarch, of a law which is not outwardly written in books, but implanted in the heart of man. Neoptolemus refused to save Greece at the expense of a lie. Antigone did not hesitate to violate the temporary law of the city in order that she might fulfill the eternal law of fraternal love, and Socrates rejected the opportunity of saving his life by escaping from prison, in order that he might preserve to the last his loyalty to the magistrates. It was his idea of duty. This original revelation which God has made in the heart of man is the beginning of all other revelations, and is fundamental to all others, for without it no other would be possible.

(2) In the physical creation. Here also God has revealed himself to all men. "The heavens declare

the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork," and they do it "to the end of the world," (Psa. xix). "The invisible things of Him since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made, even his everlasting power and divinity." (Rom. i: 20). But, of course, "the more God is otherwise known, the more this whole infinite, visible creation declares His invisible glory, and reveals His hidden nature and will."

(3) In history. More and more is God revealing himself in the natural events of human history. The history of the world was once the recognized history of redemption, and is becoming so again. "To the ordinary reader of the world's history, the whole appears like a chaos of incidents, no thread, no system, no line of connection running through it. One course of events is seen here, and another there. Kingdoms rise on the stage one after another, and become great and powerful, and then pass away and are forgotten. And the history of the Church seems scarcely less a chaos than that of the world. Changes are continually going on within it and around it, and these apparently without much order." But it is not a chaos. The hand of God has always "wide worked through the universal frame," and worked to a definite end. To him, especially, who has some preparation for divine instruction, is this Hand visible. To him all human history is a divine, yet natural, revelation of truths of eternal significance and perpetual freshness and force. History's lessons are God's lessons. But after all, the natural revelation of God in the human heart with its mysterious whisperings and strivings; in the physical creation, with all its wondrous glories; and in human

history with its mighty pulsations, was not enough. The less there is known of God otherwise, the darker and more voiceless is the natural revelation. It exhibits God to man chiefly in the relation of Sovereign Creator to those whom He has created. And here He might have paused forever in the process of revealing himself; for, "from the standpoint of creation, no other interposition or manifestation of Deity could have been demanded" than that of One who created, and governs, and preserves. Man having abused his liberty, and lost the power of attaining the end which he was designed to reach, "God in the exercise of free grace entered into another relationship with man, different from that of merely the Creator towards the creature. In virtue of this eternal council of grace, he appeared from the commencement as the Guardian and Guide of man, and as such He condescended and adapted himself to the wants of man's childhood. He, as it were, grows with him, and so draws him to Himself. When, by an abuse of his liberty, man had fallen into sin and misery, He opened up before him the salvation provided in that Council, and continued it by a progressive communication of Himself, and condescending to man, until its fulness was attained by the incarnation of God." [Kurtz.] And this special, Divine, progressive manifestation of Himself to man, in its historical, doctrinal and ethical aspects is

Second. The Biblical revelation. Here God is presented not merely as the Creator, Governor, and Preserver, but especially as One who would redeem man, and who for this purpose is revealing Himself to him. The unique character of the Biblical revelation

may here be briefly considered under a four-fold point of view: The agent, the form, the method, and the subject-matter.

(1) The Agent. The revealing agent, or one who reveals, in all divine revelations, is God. But in the Biblical revelation the revealing agent is God as the Holy Spirit, or God as the Logos or Eternal Word. The holy men of old spake to their contemporaries as they were moved by the Holy Spirit; and their words were committed to writing under the same Spirit's superintendence. The whole Bible is inspired in a sense in which no other book is; and the revelation of which it is the record, as well as the revelation which it is itself, differs in this respect from all other revelations.

(2) The Form. While, as has been said above, even all "natural" revelations of God are in some sense supernatural, the Biblical revelation is supernatural in a peculiar sense. It implies not only inspiration, but the personal manifestation of God, and miracle. The human faculty, however, to which all these supernatural elements must necessarily appeal, is that faculty by means of which man apprehends and believes religious and spiritual truths. Further than this there can be no demonstration, or absolute proof. Man may always deny, if he chooses or desires to do so, even though Lazarus should return with messages from the dead. In this domain, knowledge and faith are identical. But faith in the Biblical revelation is not merely faith in its supernaturalness. It involves many facts and truths which are known to be such on other grounds. Man does not need a revelation, supernatural in the sense in which we are here using the

term, in order that he may know that sin is hateful to God, and that without faith in Him it is impossible to please God. These things are already known, and the fact that the Biblical revelation here, and on so many other points, testifies in harmony with the natural, is only additional evidence that the Biblical revelation may be true in regard to matters beyond the range of the natural.

(3) The Method. As has already been stated, its method is that of an historical process. *First*, the period of two thousand years from Adam to Abraham, during which the knowledge of God, so far as the Biblical record informs us, was mainly the remnant of that which was originally revealed to Adam, or such as might be derived through the light of nature and history, with here and there a brighter gleam through a higher revelation; *second*, the period from Abraham to Moses, four hundred years, in which the higher verbal revelation was far more frequent; and so on through other periods to the close of the Biblical revelation. “Pre-eminently indispensable it is,” says Dr. Ladd, “that there shall be a process of revelation,” . . and . . “there is no proof for the truth of Old Testament religion superior to this, that this religion is the only one of the religions of antiquity which exhibits the conception of an historical and genetic process of revelation.” Whether it be the strongest proof or not, it is a remarkable one.

(4) The Subject-Matter, or Contents. Here the unique character of the Biblical revelation is apparent, to the most unskilled observer. The best results of natural revelation, as embodied in the Sacred Books of the East, fall far below it. The Vedas of the Indians, the Y Kings of the Chinese, the Zendavesta of the

Persians, the Eddas of the ancient Germans, and the Koran of the Mohammedans—these are faithful representations of heathen religions, all of which are essentially mythical. So much of doctrine as these books contain is only a sort of scholastic system, while the Biblical revelation is historical and also deeply practical. The Hebrews lived in immediate and constant contact with powerful polytheisms, and were themselves in tendency persistently polytheistic; and yet the Old Testament religion is uncompromisingly monotheistic, and it is the only one that is. The Pentateuch was written, and the revelations embodied in its four last books especially, were made when the Hebrews were scarcely freed from Egypt; and yet, says Rawlinson, no contrast can be greater than that between the Pentateuch and the Egyptian sacred book called the Ritual of the Dead, “unless it be that between the Pentateuch and the Zendavesta, or between the same work and the Vedas. A superficial resemblance may perhaps be traced between portions of the Pentateuch and the creation-myths of ancient Babylon; but the tone and spirit of the two are so markedly different, that neither can be regarded as the original of the other. When they approach most nearly, as in the accounts given of the Deluge, while the facts recorded are the same, or nearly the same, the religious standpoint is utterly unlike.” But, aside from its ethics and special doctrines, which will be considered more at length in the course of this work, the crowning distinction of the Biblical revelation is the apocalypse of a personal Redeemer. This, indeed, is the beginning, the middle and the end of the whole process of revelation. It is not only true that in no other revelation,

or religion, is *the* Christ found, but it is true that in no other is even a Christ found. The purpose of redemption as wrought out according to an historical process, and as embodied in a personal Redeemer of the race and of the individual, is not merely one factor of the Biblical revelation, but it is the central factor which permeates all others, and imparts to them their highest significance.

The story of Genesis can be read aright only when regarded as an essential part of the later story of the God-Man. Natural revelation as lying at the basis of all heathen religions, may have a beginning, but it has no end from which to derive significance. It is like a book half completed, ending in the middle of a sentence. The question, Oh, that I knew when and how I might find Him, remains in all heathen religions forever unanswered. "Our hearts," as Augustine said, "are formed for Christ, and they are restless until they find rest in Him." The Bible reveals Him; and in this the Bible is the Book without a peer.

III.—THE RELATION OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS TO EACH OTHER.

The Old and New Testaments are two volumes to the same book, but they are not simply that. They are, indeed, much more than that, covering, as they do, not wholly different ground, but rather different aspects of the same ground. In other words, they treat different aspects of one and the same subject, viz.: God's purpose and plan of redemption.

First. They stand to each other in the first place in

the relation of *contrast*. The Old Testament is largely an historical book, embracing many nations within the scope of its vision, and giving a running chronicle of the world and its peoples over a period of more than three thousand years. It is concerned, however, chiefly with the training of a single nation into the character of God's people, and the training is effected largely by types, and symbols, and complex ritual. To such an extent, indeed, is this true, that Paul, in contrasting some of the phases of the Old with corresponding phases of the New, speaks of the former as darkness and the latter as light; the one as bondage, the other as liberty; the one as shadow, the other as substance; the one as letter, the other as spirit; the one as elements, or rudiments of the world, the other as an heavenly kingdom; the one, dealing chiefly in external and carnal institutions, was intended to be only temporary; the other, dealing chiefly in the spiritual aspects of salvation, rather than with forms and observances, was intended to be perpetual. The second, or New Testament dispensation of the church on earth, is also the last one. Considering them as mere economies, the Old, of course, is far inferior to the New, and at the same time more elaborate and imposing. But he who considers either as a mere system of rules and regulations fails to perceive its highest significance to us. Whatever the Old Testament economy may have been to the Old Testament Israel, it is something more than an economy to us. The Old Testament dispensation and the Old Testament itself are for us two different things. It is the province, in part, of the Old Testament to furnish us with a description of the Church as an organization as it obtained in Old Testa-

ment times; but there is vastly more in it than the description of an obsolete economy. There is much in it that the contemporary Israelite did not regard as an essential part of that economy at all, and which, indeed, was not, and it would have had no less value to the contemporary Israelite had it never been recorded. There is much general history, and special history, and inspired meditation, and prophecy, which, strictly speaking, are no part of the Mosaic economy, but which are none the less valuable. The Old Testament abounds in law, and emphasizes observance; but it is far more than law, and he who in contrasting the Old with the New books looks upon the former as mere law and the latter as mere antithetical Gospel, does injustice to both.

Second. In the second place, the two Testaments bear to each other the relation of *identity*: not of absolute identity, of course, but as essential parts of the same process; an identity like that which the roots of the tree have with that part which is above ground, both being pervaded by the same sap. The Bible, though made up of many books, is yet one book. The two Testaments may in some sense be called the two volumes. Each would be incomplete without the other, and each is essential to a right and thorough understanding of the other. The Old looks forward to the New; the New looks backward to the Old. Each is an inspired record of historical facts, doctrines and precepts. Each not only *contains* the Word of God, but each *is* the Word of God. The Church in each is the same, and so are the doctrines, however veiled they may be in the one, however unveiled in the other. The same crimson thread runs through both, and each

is animated by the same breath. The central thought of the one is also the central thought of the other, viz.: God's purpose to redeem man, and the plan whereby he would do it. Many details are involved in the revelation and execution of this purpose; for the purpose presupposes a plan. Redemption implies a great deal; the death of the incarnate Son of God, and much more. It implies on the part of man a knowledge of God, and also of himself, his condition, his needs, his responsibility to God, his possibilities. It has reference to the race as well as to the individual; it means transference from darkness to light; it means transformation; it means an uplifting from degradation, a displacement of heathenism and the substitution in its stead of all that is now meant by Christianity. God could have revealed his purpose to save man in one short sentence, as he actually did to Adam (Gen. iii: 15), and faith in that briefly revealed purpose was sufficient for Adam's redemption, as it is for any man's. But the purpose implied a plan, the execution of which implied its revelation. The purposed redemption contemplated more than the rescue of Adam. Myriads of human beings were to come from his loins, all of whom would also need to be redeemed. So far, indeed, as the Old Testament people are concerned, the process of revealing the plan to them is also the process of executing it. Adam's redemption was completed in himself, but that of his race was not. As in Adam's case, so also in the case of subsequent patriarchs to whom God revealed his purpose: all that was needful on their part was faith in the simply, briefly expressed purpose. They had no knowledge of the details and they could have no faith in the details. Even in the case of the so-

called typical sacrifices, which were offered from the beginning, the faith was not in the sacrifice, nor in the act of sacrificing, but it was in the divine purpose to redeem, in some unknown way, which lay behind the sacrifice, and of which the sacrifice was a memorial. Salvation has always been more than a mere individual affair; it is also an affair of the race. The divine purpose to save could not be supernaturally revealed to every man, one by one, through the generations, as it was to Adam, Abraham, Moses, and other selected individuals. At any rate, if this be deemed a possible way, it was not regarded by God as the best way; it was not his plan. He teaches a few here and there through the old centuries, and these few, under his direction, teach the revealed purpose to many, and these to many more. The sacrifices, circumcision, and, indeed, everything which contributed to the make-up of what we may call the Old Testament Church, instead of being regarded as types in the usual sense of the term, should rather be regarded as memorials of God's simple purpose to redeem; just as the Lord's Supper and all that contributes to the make-up of the New Testament Church may be regarded as a memorial of the same fact.

The additions made, from time to time, to the simple purpose to redeem, as originally revealed, are determined by circumstances as they arise, and by the details of the plan known only to God. But through the whole series of revelations, from Adam to the close of the New Testament period, "one increasing purpose runs." The Old Testament may be regarded as in some sense the record of these revelations; or, in other words, of how God was gradually unfolding and

executing his purpose. The New Testament, on the other hand, is the record of later revelations and events looking to the same end, viz.: the redemption of man. In the Old Testament times, those to whom God made known his purpose and will were his Church, and it was used by him as the instrument or means of its own enlargement; so it was also in the New Testament times, the Church in the latter case, in so far as its external organism and doctrines are concerned, being only a new phase of the Church in the former. They were essentially the same church, and essentially the same doctrines. Noah, or Abraham, or David, was saved in precisely the same way as Paul or Polycarp—that is, by faith in God's revealed purpose. Neither the saints of the Old Testament nor of the New understood the mystery of God manifest in the flesh, however much more those of the latter may have known about it than those of the former. This simple revealed purpose and faith in it, with all that faith implies, however vaguely it may be understood, are all that are absolutely necessary to the salvation of any man in the narrower sense of that term. And this simple purpose is definitely revealed in both Testaments. But salvation, in the broader sense of the term, means something more than immunity from sin and punishment, whether in this world or in the next. It means the reconstruction of the race and of the earth, the removal of sin and its consequences, the restoration in Christ, and through him, of all that man the individual and man the race had forfeited in Adam. More was needed, therefore, as the race multiplied, than the revelation of the mere purpose to redeem. Individual education, and social education, a

Divine course of tuition, patient and continued through a long series of centuries, are needed; and hence the Old Testament is as it is, instead of a sentence, viz.: Gen. iii: 15. It is conceivable that the whole Bible is not essential to the being of the Church, for there was a time when the church did not have it; but however this may be, it is certainly essential to the *well-being* of the Church.

But while, as we have said, the Bible is a record of revelation, it is also to us more than that; it is a revelation itself. We now know the purpose and will of God just as truly and more completely than any one generation of the church in Bible times. We have the advantage of the accumulated tuition and experience of the church in all the periods of revelation. Had no written revelation been furnished the church, it would have been necessary, in order to its continued well-being, to constantly repeat, in its actual life, the contents of the revelation as we now have it. The Bible, then, is not merely an historical record of certain events which took place and of Divine words which were spoken from time to time through the ancient centuries; but it is a record made under Divine superintendence, and for the express benefit of the Church in all ages; and it is as truly a revelation to us as if its contents had been divinely made known to us *ab initio* as they were to the ancient Church.

NOTE.—The question of the relation of the two Testaments involves the question of the relation of the Church under the two respectively. To admit the unity of the former is to admit the essential identity of the latter, and that the mode of salvation under the two dispensations was the same. This, for the most part, has been the belief of the Christian church from the earliest ages. The ancient Ebionites, however, exaggerated the

Old Testament to the extreme disparagement of the New, while the Manichaens wholly rejected the Old. The Alexandrian school, by an allegorizing exegesis, asserted too close an identity between the New and the Old. The motto of Augustine was in the main the belief of the ancient church: The New Testament lies hid in the Old: the Old Testament lies open in the New. The Reformers taught that the church began in Paradise and continues through all time. But by Luther and others the unity between the Testaments was conceived of rather as a doctrinal identity, or harmony, than as the unity produced by a gradually advancing process of development. Calvin, on the other hand, emphasizes it in both aspects. He discusses at length the "Similarity" and difference of the two Testaments in his Institutes, Book II., chapters x. and xi. "I readily admit," says he, "the differences which are mentioned in the Scripture, but I maintain that they derogate nothing from the unity already established [in the preceding chapter.] . . . I assert and engage to prove that all these are such as pertain rather to the mode of administration than to the substance. In this view, they will not prevent the promises of the Old and New Testaments from remaining the same, and the promises of both Testaments from having in Christ the same foundation." . . . "Therefore the Lord kept them under this tuition [of the young heir referred to in Gal. iv], that he might give them the spiritual promises, not open and unconcealed, but veiled under terrestrial figures." . . . "It is a proof, therefore, of the constancy of God, that He has delivered the same doctrine in all ages, and perseveres in requiring the same worship of His name, which He commanded from the beginning. By changing the external form and mode He has discovered no mutability in Himself, but has so far accommodated Himself to the capacity of men, which is various and mutable."

"Here [in the Old Testament] shalt thou find the swaddling clothes and the manger in which Christ lies. Poor and of little value are the swaddling clothes, but dear is Christ, the treasure that lies in them."—Luther in his preface to the Old Testament. "Moses is the fountain of all wisdom and understanding, out of which welled all that was known and told by all the prophets. The New Testament also flows from it, and is grounded therein. If thou will interpret well and surely, take Christ for thee; for he is the man to whom alone all refers."—Ibid. "Christ came in the spirit of the Old Testament fathers before he appeared in

the flesh. . . . And they were saved by Him, just as we are. Jesus Christ, the same yesterday and forever.”—Ibid (on Gal. iv. 2).

There is one perpetual church of God from the promulgation of the promise after the fall of Adam, and the doctrines of it were always the same, though the manner of embodying and propagating them varied.—(*Melancthon.*) “The Bible can never be rightly studied unless the two Testaments are comprehended in their unity and harmony. If the Old Testament is in the New in fulfillment, the New is in the Old in promise. There is force in the thought of Archbishop Trench, that in a just and reasonable sense, all the Old Testament is prophetic—that the subtle threads of prophecy are woven through every part of the texture, not separable from thence without rending and destroying the whole;” and the prophecy which the Old Testament, even in its entirety, was always uttering, directly or indirectly, in one form or another, was prophecy of the Christ who should come, and of the redemption wrought through Him.

OLD TESTAMENT STUDY.

OLD TESTAMENT STUDY.

ITS SCOPE.

That form of biblical study called Old Testament theology deals, as we have seen, with the entire contents of the Old Testament—that is, with its historical as well as its other parts. The people, however, to whom God made special revelations of Himself, and to whom from time to time He unfolded in a special manner His purpose of redemption, and who were themselves a party to this process of unfolding, lived in the midst of peoples who were wholly outside of the sphere of revelation. These latter had a religion made up of beliefs and practices peculiar to themselves for the most part, but which, nevertheless, at times greatly influenced the chosen people, and were now and then, to a greater or less extent, adopted by them.

The background of the Old Testament revelation is a dark heathenism, and its surroundings also, in the midst of which it glows like a diamond. Numerous allusions are made in the Old Testament to the contemporary heathen beliefs and practices; indeed a large part of the Old Testament is devoted to a history of the struggle against heathenism. While, therefore, Old Testament theology deals with the whole contents of the Old Testament, it discriminates closely between that which is within the sphere of revelation and that

which is without; although this latter falls under the constant purview of the inspired historians and prophets, and hence in this sense makes up a large part of the Bible. In other words, it discriminates between what Noah, Abraham, Moses and the rest believed and did as the recipients of Divine revelations, and what they believed and did as ordinary men. Any other view either lowers Old Testament theology to the level of a treatise on heathenism and mere natural religion, or elevates the latter to the level of the former. The author of the book of Exodus, for example, says that "the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart." Passing by, for the moment, as it does not just now concern us, the fact that the author of Exodus was supernaturally inspired to say this, the question that would here arise is: Does this saying of the writer represent the current belief, whether of the Hebrews or the Egyptians, concerning the sovereignty of the Supreme Being over human hearts and lives, or does it represent simply the view of the author? If the former, the saying furnishes an insight into the theological status of the times in regard to this matter of the absolute sovereignty of the Divine Being. But if it was not a matter of current belief, it was of no special value to the contemporaries of the author, only in so far as they had confidence in his superior knowledge or inspiration; and if they accepted it as a true statement, in any sense, it would be regarded by them as an addition to their small knowledge of the Divine Being. The object of Old Testament theology, whether as a branch of biblical science or as a method of Bible study, is not merely to present the teachings of the Old Testament in systematic form, but also to ascertain the various factors of

the Old Testament religion in the order in which they were made, whether in a natural or supernatural way.

Nor does Old Testament theology have anything to do with the question of the authorship and composition of the Biblical books; the discussion of the several documents and codes of which some suppose the Pentateuch to be composed; the dates of Job, Daniel, Deuteronomy, or other books; the integrity of the book of Isaiah or Zechariah—these lie beyond its province. Old Testament theology accepts the generally conceded conclusions of historical and textual criticism in so far as the conclusions concern it, but it does not argue them. The subject-matter of the books in their accepted chronological order, is that with which it has to do.

In the progress of our study of the Old Testament, we shall also have occasion to distinguish between the word and purpose of God as revealed in history and prophecy, and the same as set forth in such inspired meditations as the books of Job, Ecclesiastes, and many of the Psalms. In the former we may trace what may be called the objective unfolding, or development of the Old Testament religion, because the knowledge of God, in this instance, comes from without into man. In the latter, the knowledge of God is awakened directly in man's mind or heart apart from the immediate agency of teaching or historical object-lesson. Hence, this may be called the subjective development of the Old Testament religion.

The whole may be considered under the three-fold and natural division of: (1) The Old Testament religion in the pre-Mosaic times; (2) In the Mosaic times; (3) In the times of the Prophets; where first appears the distinction, "objective" and "subjective" revelation.

Oehler includes our First and Second Divisions in one, and calls it Mosaism. But there were, as we have seen, various elements of a supernatural revelation, and of a religion, natural and supernatural, existing from the very beginning, and in the communication of which Moses had no part, of course. It seems better therefore to distinguish by name as well as in fact the pre-Mosaic elements from the increments which were added through Moses. Oehler also gives a separate Division to the subjective elements of the Old Testament religion, commonly called the Old Testament Wisdom; but as these increments, consisting in inspired meditations, were made synchronously with the Prophetic Period, I include this as a subdivision in our Third Division.

DIVISION I.

THE PRE-MOSAIC PERIOD.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORICAL; OR, THE PRINCIPAL FACTS OF THIS PERIOD.

God revealed himself to the world in various ways and at various times; as in the creation; his dealings with Adam; the deluge; his dealings with the patriarchs, etc. The Old Testament is not primarily this revelation, but is rather the inspired history, or record, of it. Old Testament theology deals with the historical facts recorded, because the very nature of the Old Testament requires that it should first appear as deeds, or as life, in an historical form; then, and not until then, can it appear as doctrine. Had not this been the *natural* and *necessary* order of revelation, that which we call the Bible, including both Testaments, might just as well have been a compend of theological doctrines, instead of being also, and in large part, a record of historical facts. In as much, then, as the recorded revelation embraces both history and doctrines announced orally, every period will be divided into an historical and doctrinal section. The historical section, however, will not be an enumeration of every event recorded, but only of such as possess in themselves a degree of significance, or furnish us an insight into the

Old Testament divinely given religion. If the Genesis statement of the fact of creation, for example, were simply one among many, and on a level in all respects with them, it would possess no more pertinency to Old Testament theology than any one of the others. But in the Genesis account God is on the one hand and the fact of creation is on the other, and the two are so linked as cause and effect as to furnish us an important and peculiar glimpse of the Divine Being and the relation in which he stands to the animate and inanimate worlds. And the glimpse of God we have here is in harmony with every subsequent one. Hence, it is incumbent upon Old Testament theology to study all facts which embody revelations or interpret revelations. But in its historical department, it seeks chiefly to recount how God revealed himself to the world, making known, not only *himself*, but also his will and his plan of redemption. In its doctrinal department, it seeks *what* he revealed concerning himself, his will, and his plan. “Revelation is pre-eminently truth which has been done in history;” a “‘Thus did the Lord,’ as well as a ‘Thus saith the Lord.’”

§ 1. *The Creation.*

There was a religion—certain things believed and certain things done—long before there was a written revelation. The human race had existed on the earth at least twenty-five centuries before anything was written. What we here term the pre-Mosaic religion, is the religion which obtained during this period, that is, from the creation of Adam to the time of Moses. The source of our information is chiefly the book of Genesis, the researches into the ancient Assyrian, Egyptian

and other non-Biblical religions, furnishing certain legitimate inferences and glimpses. On the supposition that that Genesis is wholly the production of Moses, the inquiry here to be made is: In writing the account of the creation, to what extent was he writing something entirely new to his contemporaries? If he was writing something wholly new to them, to what extent was it unknown to Jacob, Abraham, Noah, or the antedeluvians? It is obvious, therefore, that in seeking to determine the elements of the Pre-Mosaic religion, we must discriminate between the elements of faith and practice which were made known for the first time through Moses, and those which were known before and were truly put on record by him.

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth; and the earth was without form and void; and darkness was on the face of the deep; and so on through all the details to the end of the account. We can only infer that Adam knew these things. It is nowhere stated that God made the facts known to him in any supernatural way; and if we suppose that he did, it is nowhere stated that the revelation was repeated to any of his posterity prior to the time of Moses. But the inference is reasonable that the belief of Adam in the supernatural origin of all things was founded on a supernatural revelation made to him, and that the belief of his posterity in the same was founded, during his personal presence among them, on their confidence in him, and subsequently on their confidence in the tradition handed down from him and on the very inability of their minds to conceive either of absolute commencement or infinite non-commencement. As soon, however, as this tradition, in its purity, was

lost, the element of pre-Mosaic religion which was founded upon it, also lost its supernatural character, and the religion became so far a mere natural religion like that of any other heathen people. Even if we suppose that it was possible, it was not consonant with what we now know of the Divine plan, that the revelation of the supernatural origin of all things should be supernaturally made to every individual of Adam's posterity down to the time of Moses, only in so far as it had been made once for all in the very constitution of the human mind.

Unless we suppose, then, that Moses, in writing Genesis, and particularly the first chapter of it, was merely putting on record something that had always been well known, we are obliged to conclude that the majority of those who lived before him had no more knowledge concerning the origin of things than was furnished by the unwritten book of nature interpreted in the light of a distorted and fading tradition. Whether this supposition concerning the relation of Moses to the first chapter of Genesis is tenable or not, it belongs to the province of criticism, rather than of Old Testament theology, to decide. One thing, however, we may affirm: Moses was not a mere historian. He knew more than merely what had transpired in the centuries and ages past. He was progressive. He stood far in advance of his ancestors and of his contemporaries. Through him were introduced various additions to old beliefs, and various innovations upon the old ethics and culture. And there is something in his account of creation—in its grand silences, its unparalleled literary merit, its marvelous scientific accuracy, its simple yet transcendent dignity—there is

something in it in all respects, indeed, as compared with all the ancient accounts of the creation which have come down to us from the Babylonians, Persians, Egyptians and others, that leads us to believe that there was in the vicinity of Moses when he wrote it down a Divine Revealer. He was not simply recording an old story which he had learned in childhood at the knee of Jochebed, his mother. He was adding some entirely new factor to the knowledge and religion of his people.

The exact date of the Chaldean account of the creation is a matter only of conjecture; but it is known to be exceedingly ancient, and from it we may infer the character of view entertained by the pre-Mosaic peoples concerning the origin of the world. The author of Genesis makes no definite statement in regard to the matter in the subsequent chapters wherein he treats of the primeval races, though it is plainly implied that mankind had rapidly lost whatever clear knowledge on the subject may have been originally communicated to Adam. The following extract from the Chaldean Creation Tablets was made by Mr. H. F. Talbot, and published in volume III of the "Records of the Past." Many of these brick tablets, inscribed in cuneiform character, have been excavated within recent years from the buried ruins of Assyria and Babylonia by Mr. George Smith and others. The one here quoted appears to be a fragment of a creation poem, or epic, such as some suppose the Mosaic account to be, though it falls far below the latter in spirit, dignity, and religious standpoint. It runs thus:

"When the upper region was not yet called heaven;
and the lower region was not yet called earth; and the

abyss of hades had not yet opened its arms; then the chaos of waters gave birth to all of them, and the waters were gathered into one place. No men yet dwelt together; no animals had yet wandered about; none of the gods had yet been born; their names were not spoken; their attributes were not known. Then the eldest of the gods, Lakhmu and Lakamu, were born and grew up. . . . Assur and Kissur were born next, and lived through long periods."

In another tablet we have the following, corresponding to the Mosaic account of the creation of the heavenly bodies:

"He constructed dwellings for the great gods. He fixed up constellations, whose figures were like animals. He made the year. Into four quarters he divided it. Twelve months he established, with their constellations three by three.

"And for days of the year he appointed festivals. He made dwellings for the planets; for their rising and setting, and that nothing should go amiss, and that the course of none should be retarded, he placed with them the dwellings of Bel and Hea.*

"He made strong the portals on the left hand and on the right. In the centre he placed luminaries. The moon he appointed to rule the night, and to wander through the night until the dawn of day. Every month without fail he made holy assembly days. In the beginning of the month, at the rising of the night, it shot forth its horns to illumine the heavens.

* In the Assyrian hierarchy Assur was the supreme god. Anu, Bel, and Ea, were Creative powers, the last being the Lord of the Deep. Sin was the Moon-god; Shamas, the Sun-god; Rimmon, the Sky-god; Ishtar was the (planet) Venus-goddess; Adar, Saturn; Nergal, Mars; Nabu, Mercury.

“On the seventh day he appointed a holy day; and to cease from all business he commanded. There arose the sun in the horizon of heaven in glory.”

The version of this Babylonian legend, or of another part of the same, given by the Chaldean priest, Berosus, as quoted by Eusebius, is as follows:

“In the beginning all was darkness and water, and therein were generated monstrous animals of strange and peculiar forms. There were men with two wings, and some even with four, and with two faces; and others with two heads—a man’s and a woman’s—on the same body; and there were men with the heads and horns of goats, and men with hoofs like horses, and some with the upper parts of a man joined to the lower parts of a horse, like centaurs; and there were bulls with human heads, dogs with four bodies and with the tails of fishes; men and horses with dogs’ heads; creatures with the heads and bodies of horses, but with fishes’ tails, mixing the forms of various beasts.

“Moreover, there were monstrous fishes and serpents, which had borrowed something from each other’s shapes, of all which the likenesses are still found in the temple of Belus. A woman ruled them all, by name Omorka, which is in Chaldea, Thalath, and in Greek, Thalassa (The Sea). Then Belus appeared and split the woman in twain; and of the one half of her he made the heaven, and of the other half the earth, and the beasts that were in her he caused to perish. And he split the darkness, and divided the heaven and the earth asunder, and put the world in order, and the animals that could not bear the light perished.

“Belus, upon this, seeing that the earth was desolate,

yet teeming with productive powers, commanded one of the gods to cut off his head, and to mix the blood which flowed forth with earth, and form men therewith, and beasts that could bear the light. So man was made, and was intelligent, being a partaker of the Divine wisdom. Likewise Belus made the stars, and the sun, and the moon, and the five planets."

The legendary and polytheistic character of these accounts is obvious even to the casual reader; but they serve to illustrate what were probably the current views, outside of the sphere of revelation, in the primeval times, in regard to the origin of the heaven and the earth, and all that in them is. We see in some of them at least, but only here and there, faint glimpses of the truth and grand simplicity which characterize the Scripture account throughout. The difference between the two is as marked, as that of the darkened sun in the act of rising above the horizon, "shorn of its beams" by dense fog, and the noon-day sun shining with unobstructed splendor. And this difference can be accounted for only on the supposition that our Scripture narrative of the origin of things was the offspring of much more than the mere natural and imaginative genius of an oriental writer. So immeasurably inferior is the primeval cosmogony to the Mosaic, or Hebrew, that we are utterly forbidden to suppose that the latter could have been derived from Babylon or any other purely human source. But while some such views as the above were doubtless held by the majority of mankind in pre-Mosaic times, there were some, as Noah and Abraham, who held the truth in much greater purity.

§ 2. The Primeval Abode and Fall of Man.

Here also we are in the region of conjecture and tradition. The sacred Scriptures nowhere inform us what views were held by the pre-Mosaic peoples in regard to the first state of man and the origin of evil. Traditions of a primitive state of innocence are traceable to the earliest ages, some of them antedating, perhaps, not only the narrative of Gen. ii, 8-25, but also the dispersion of the tribes as recorded in Gen. xi; the common source from which all these traditions were drawn being, doubtless, the original account of the matter by Adam himself.

These traditions, in some instances, diverge very far from the Scripture version of the facts, but they show that there must have been a wide-spread belief, even in the pre-Mosaic times, that man had not always been what he then was. It seems to have been the common belief that the first state of man was one of innocence and bliss. The tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and the fall in all its details, appear in all these traditions, nor are vestiges of the flaming sword and the cherubim wanting.

Nor are these traditions restricted to peoples of the Shemitic race. According to very ancient Aryan tradition, "the first man passed his life in a state of bliss, until he committed the sin which weighs on his descendants. For this he was driven out of paradise, after being a thousand years in it, and was given up to the dominion of the serpent, who finally brought about his death by horrible torments." According to the Zoroastrian tradition, "the god, Ahuramazda, created man perfect and holy, and destined to immortal happiness,

if he continued pure in thought, word, and deed, and humble in heart. He placed him in the best of dwelling places. At first he remained true to God; but later falsehood ran through his thoughts; for the evil spirit, the serpent, seduced first the woman and then the man to believe that they were indebted for all their blessings, not to God, but to him. Having thus led them astray, the deceiver, who had lied them to their ruin, grew more bold, and presented himself a second time, bringing them fruits which they ate, and by eating which they lost all the hundred blessings which they had save one, and were wicked and unhappy. They clothed themselves with the skins of animals which they killed, and offered the flesh as sacrifice."

The early Chaldean account of the curse pronounced against the first offenders after their transgression, in so far as it has been ascertained, runs as follows:

The Lord of the earth called his name; the Father Ilu in the ranks of the angels pronounces the curse. The god Hea heard, and his liver grew angry, because the man had corrupted his purity. Thus (spake) Hea: "How can I punish —(How can I) destroy all my race!" In the language of the fifty great gods, by their fifty names he calls them, and he turns himself from him (man) in wrath. "Let him be overcome and destroyed at a blow," (said he). "Let wisdom and science be against him and hurt him. Let enmity be between father and son. Let robbery abound; Let them bend their ear to their king, their chief, their ruler; Let them thus anger the Lord of the gods, Merodach. Let the earth produce, but let no man eat of its bounty. Let his desires be frustrated; his will be unaccomplished. Let no god take heed when he opens his

mouth. Let his back be hurt and not cured. Let no god hear the piercing cry of his anguish, Let his heart faint and his soul be troubled."

"The ancient Egyptians looked back on the terrestrial reign of the god Ra as a time of such purity and happiness that they were wont to speak of anything especially perfect as having been unequaled since the days of that god." The heathen Hesiod, who wrote eight or nine hundred years before Christ, in his *Works and Days*, thus echoes a tradition many centuries older than himself: "So at first lived the race of earth-tilling men, Kept far from suffering or from weary toil; and from sad disease which brings death to mankind; for trouble makes mortals early grow old. Easily then would they do in one day the work, the work which now needs a full year, and that often profitless."

But this happy state did not last long. The god became offended.

"The earth around is full of evil, and so is the wide sea. Diseases as well, by day and also by night, Approach unbidden and bring evils to mortals. They come still and softly, for Zeus Kronion has made them dumb."

We are not concerned here with the resemblances and contrasts which these legends bear to the Mosaic account. They are doubtless a fair illustration of the beliefs in regard to the subjects of which they treat, entertained by the pre-Mosaic peoples who lived outside of the range of pre-Mosaic revelation. From Adam to the Deluge, according to the ordinary chronology, was a period of 1656 years. At the expiration of this time the population of the earth must have been

many millions, according even to the present laws of human increase. Many millions more had probably died before the flood came. Only a few of this immense number could come under the immediate tuition of the few who may have received immediate revelation from God concerning the primitive happy state of innocence, and the subsequent fall of man. In like manner, from the flood to the time of Moses was a period of about eight hundred and fifty years. At the expiration of this time, the population of the earth was doubtless as great as it was at the time of the flood. In four hundred years, or less than half of the whole time, the one family of Abraham numbered 600,000 adult men. During the first four hundred years after the Deluge it is not related that any man received a direct revelation. Whatever information may have been received from Noah would rapidly become distorted as men multiplied and proceeded further and further from the original central home.

We are definitely informed by the author of Genesis that Abraham and subsequent patriarchs of the same family did receive immediate revelations; but these revelations were matters of faith, even to them, and were not of such character or contents as to have a beneficial influence on any of their contemporaries. Even had he admitted it to be a fact, it would have been a matter of no especial interest to the Canaanite, for example, to know that Abraham had received a revelation from God to the effect that he should have a son of promise, whose seed should become a mighty nation and occupy the same country where they themselves then were; and whatever evangelistic element the revelation may have been understood to involve, it

is not related that the patriarchs sought to impose it upon, or promulgate it among, their neighbors. It is reasonable to suppose, therefore, that at the time the author of Genesis recorded the revelations which he himself received, mankind generally knew nothing but the distorted traditions which still lingered among them in one form or another.

§3. *The Noachic Deluge.*

As our object in the preceding sections was to discuss, not the accounts of the subjects therein treated, as revealed in the book of Genesis, but the views entertained concerning them before the Mosaic revelation was recorded; so, also, our object here is to present the views concerning the Noachic flood, which were current before the time of Moses.

Traditions concerning this undoubtedly historical event are found among all the nations of the earth. Even if we had no proof that any of these traditions antedated the book of Genesis, we might still infer from them what the pre-Mosaic view of the matter was, at least as held by peoples living outside the sphere of pre-Mosaic revelations. There is no reason, however, that we should suppose that even such a "friend of God" as Abraham was, by a supernatural revelation, kept from error in regard to the details of an historical fact of this character. The population of the earth in that age, though doubtless reaching many millions, was not sufficiently scattered to render us particularly interested, so far as our present line of thought is concerned, in any of the numerous and very ancient traditions, except those of peoples living in the vicinity of the original home of the race.

Among the tablets discovered by Mr. George Smith, in excavating the ruins of Nineveh, and the royal library there, were found some relating to the great flood. The original texts of these tablets is decided by Assyrian scholars to date back at least four hundred years before the time of Moses. It appears to have belonged, in the first place, to the city of Erech, mentioned in Genesis x. 10, as being one of the capitals of Nimrod, from which city it was subsequently removed to enrich the king's library at Nineveh.

According to the legends deciphered from these tablets, Izdubar was a king, or leading man, who lived near the time of the great deluge, and belonged to Erech, the ruins of which, lying about ninety-five miles south-east from Babylon, are now called Warka. Izdubar was smitten with leprosy, and began to fear death. To escape such a fate, he wandered forth in search of a patriarch named Sisit (or Khasisatra), whom the Babylonians supposed to have become immortal without having died, to consult him concerning a cure. After sailing down the Euphrates a month and fifteen days, he came to a place near the mouth of the river, where Khasisatra was supposed to dwell. Izdubar makes known his request, but must converse across a stream which divided the mortal and the immortal from each other. The latest, and, in some of the details, the best translation of Khasisatra's reply to Izdubar, is that of Prof. Haupt. The one here given is substantially that of Prof. Lenormant:

"I will reveal to thee, O Izdubar, the history of my preservation, and tell the decision of the gods. The town of Shurippak, which, thou knowest, is on the Euphrates. It was ancient, and in it men did not honor

the gods. I alone was a servant of the great gods. The gods took counsel on the appeal of Anu. A deluge was proposed by Bel and approved by Nabon, Nergal and Adar. And the god Ea, the immutable lord, repeated this command to me in a dream:

“‘Man of Shurippak, build a vessel, and finish it quickly. I will destroy life and substance by a deluge. Cause thou to go up into the vessel the substance of all that has life. The vessel thou shalt build—600 cubits shall be the measure of its length, and 60 the measure of its breadth and of its height. Launch it thus on the ocean, and cover it with a roof.’

“I understood, and said to Ea: ‘My lord, when I shall build it, young and old will laugh at me.’

“Ea opened his mouth and spake: ‘If they laugh at thee, thou shalt say to them: He who has insulted me shall be punished, for the protection of the gods is over me. I will exercise my judgment on that which is on high, and on that which is below. Close the vessel, enter into it, and draw the door of the ship toward thee. Within it thy grain, furniture, provisions, thy man-servants, maid-servants, young people, the cattle of thy fields, and wild beasts, which I will assemble and send to thee.’

“On the fifth day the two sides of the bark were raised. The rafters in its coverings were in all fourteen. I placed its roof and I covered it. . . . I stopped up the chinks through which the water entered in. I poured on the outside three times 3,600 measures of asphalt, and three times 3,600 measures of asphalt within. Three times 3,600 men porters brought on their heads the chests of provisions. I kept 3,600 chests for the nourishment of my family, and the mari-

ners divided among them twice 3,600 chests. For provisioning I had oxen slain; I appointed rations for each day. . . . All that I possessed I gathered together—of silver, of gold, of the substance of life of every kind. I made my servants male and female, the cattle of the fields, the wild beasts, and the sons of the people, all ascend into the ship. Shamas fixed the moment, and he announced it in these terms: ‘In the evening I will cause it to rain abundantly from heaven; enter into the vessel and close the door.’ . . . Mu-sheri-inamari rose from the foundations of heaven in a black cloud; Ramman thundered in the midst of the cloud. Nabon and Shurru marched before—they marched, devastating the mountain and the plain. Nergal, the powerful, dragged the chastisements after him. Adar advanced, overthrowing before him. The archangels of the abyss brought destruction. By their terrors they agitated the earth. The flood of Ramman swelled up to the sky, and the earth, grown dark, became like a desert. They destroyed the living beings on the surface of the earth. The terrible deluge swelled up toward heaven. The brother no longer saw his brother. Men no longer knew each other. In heaven the gods became afraid of the water-spouts, and sought a refuge. They mounted up to the heaven of Anu. . . . Ishtar wailed like a child. The great goddess pronounced this discourse: ‘Here is mankind returned to the earth, and theirs is the misfortune I have announced in presence of the gods. . . .

. . . I am the mother who gave birth to men, and there they are filling the sea like the races of fishes; and the gods on their seats, by reason of that which the archangels of the abyss are doing, weep with me.’

The gods on their seats were in tears, and held their lips closed, revolving things to come. Six days passed and as many nights; the wind, the waterspouts and the deluge-rain, were in all their strength. At the approach of the seventh day the deluge-rain grew weaker, the terrible waterspout, which had been awful as an earthquake, grew calm, the sea began to dry up, and the wind and the waterspout came to an end. I looked at the sea, attentively observing, and the whole race of man had returned to earth; the corpses floated like seaweed. I opened the window, and the light smote on my face. I was seized with sadness; I sat down and wept, and the tears came over my face. I looked at the region bounding the sea, toward the twelve points of the horizon, but there was no land. The vessel was borne above the land of Nizir—the mountains of Nizir arrested the vessel, and did not permit it to pass over. For six days they thus stopped it. At the approach of the seventh day I sent out and loosed a dove. The dove went, turned, and found no place to light on, and came back. I sent out and loosed a swallow; and it went out, turned, and finding no place to rest on, came back. I sent out and loosed a raven; the raven went, and saw the corpses on the waters; it ate, rested, turned, and came not back. I then sent out the creatures in the vessel toward the four winds, and offered a sacrifice. I raised the pile of my burnt offering on the peak of the mountain. Seven by seven I laid the measured vessels, and beneath I spread rushes, cedar-wood and juniper. The gods were seized with the desire to go to it—with a benevolent desire for it. They assembled like flies above the master of the sacrifice. From afar, in approaching, the great goddess raised

the great zones that Anu made for the glory of the gods. These gods, luminous as crystal, I will never leave I prayed in that day that I might never leave them. Let the gods come to my sacrificial pile! But never may Bel come to it, for he did not master himself, for he made the waterspout for the deluge, and he remembered men for the pit. From far, in drawing near, Bel saw the vessel and stopped. He was filled with anger against the gods and against the heavenly archangels. No one shall come out alive! No man shall be preserved from the abyss. Adar opened his mouth and said—he said to the warrior Bel: ‘Who other than Ea should have found this resolution?’ for Ea possessed knowledge and all. Ea opened his mouth and spake; he said to the warrior Bel: ‘O, thou, herald of the gods, warrior—as thou didst not master thyself, thou hast made the waterspout of the deluge. Let the sinner carry the weight of his sins; the blasphemer the weight of his blasphemy. Please thyself with this good pleasure, and it shall never be infringed. . . . Instead of thy making a new deluge, let lions and hyenas appear and reduce the number of men; let there be famine, and let the earth be . . . ; let Dibbara appear, and let men be mown down. I have not revealed the decision of the great gods; it is Khasisatra who interpreted a dream, and comprehended what the gods had decided.’ Then, when his resolve was arrested, Bel entered into the vessel, and took my hand, and made me rise. He made my wife rise and place herself at my side. He walked around me and stopped short. He approached our group. Until now Khasisatra had been mortal, but now he and his wife are going to be carried away to live like the gods, and he

will live afar, at the mouth of the rivers. They carried me away, and established me in a remote place, at the mouth of the streams."

§4. *The Dispersion of the Nations.*

The waters of the flood having abated, the ark rested on one of the mountain-tops of the Ararat range, located, doubtless, in the country afterward known as Armenia. Here Noah and his family, eight souls in all, began life anew in the new world. To Japheth seven sons were born; to Shem five, and to Ham four. How long these solitary families remained in their first homes on the mountain side, or in the valleys of Armenia, we have no means of knowing. Doubtless, the locality of the first settlements of the three sons was never afterward without a population; nor is it in the least improbable that this population was distinctively and predominantly neither Japhetic, nor Shemitic, nor Hamitic. It is not likely that it was predominantly either the one or another, in respect either to blood or language; nor is it further likely that the language which this population spoke ever underwent any other changes than such as are brought about by the ordinary working of natural causes.

Probably many years passed away before any migrations occurred. The youngest son of Ham was already a lad when the incident related in Gen. ix. 20-29 took place; and the migrations did not begin until the population had considerably increased. The very solitariness of their situation in the unpeopled earth would strongly tend to hold the few together, notwithstanding the animosity which the prophecy of Noah, concerning Canaan, would probably produce in the bosom

of Ham, and in that of Canaan, also, as he grew older.

As their posterity increased, the necessity for physical maintenance, and the growing spirit of adventure, would gradually and naturally bring about a dispersion of the population. Some would find their way to the other side of the mountain, would be pleased and settle there; while others in turn would push further down the valleys, and establish new settlements. In this way, they scattered abroad over the face of the whole land, and more and more mangled the tradition of their father Noah, whom the majority of them had never seen, though he lived three hundred and fifty years after the flood. Japheth's posterity drifted northward and westward, while Shem's and Ham's moved southward. This was not because of any far-reaching or prophetic preference on their part for one direction rather than another. Neither could in the least degree foresee the effect which his movement would have upon the history of his posterity. We may admit, or affirm, that the whole matter was providential, but they doubtless consulted only present inclination or convenience. The descendants of Japheth passed out of history, and remained concealed therefrom for centuries. It does not concern us to speak of them here.

While the lines of posterity of the three sons of Noah were in the main kept distinct, it is quite probable that during the first generations, especially, intermarriages were by no means uncommon; and it is also probable that they continued to be frequent on the border lines between the races, and in already mixed settlements. Especially was this true in the early Bible

lands, where we have to do more particularly with the descendants of Shem and Ham; though it is probable that the tribal name of the father was in all instances assumed by the son, making many so-called Shemites, or Hamites, in reality mixed bloods.

As the pressure of increasing population would produce divergencies in all directions from the old central homes, so these divergencies would in turn produce differences of speech, at first amounting only to dialectical peculiarities, but gradually acquiring the prominence of distinct languages. It would naturally follow also that some of these dialects, or languages, would be distinctly neither Japhetic, nor Hamitic, nor Shemitic, but would partake to a greater or less extent of the peculiarities of one or another, according to the locality, and other circumstances, of the people speaking it, and in certain instances the peculiarities might be so evenly balanced as to render it difficult for philologists to decide where the language ought rather to be classed. Some Hamites, by reason of their associations, might speak a distinctively Shemitic tongue; some Shemites might speak a Hamitic dialect; and so also might it be with the descendants of Japheth. The early posterity of Abraham, the Phœnicians, and the Canaanitish tribes seem to have spoken the same language, though the first mentioned only were Shemitic by blood. Nor, indeed, is there any intimation that Abraham found the language of Canaan, into the midst of which he came, different, to any considerable extent, from that of Chaldea, the country from which he came.*

* "The Canaanites, however," says Prof. Sayce, "spoke a Semitic language, and belonged to the Semitic, in the modern ethnological sense of the word. Like the Arabs, the Assyrians the Armæans and the Hebrews, their primitive seat was probably

We may form an approximate estimate, perhaps, of the increase of population, and hence of the growth of linguistic and tribal divergencies, and the increasing necessity of some sort of organized government, in the following manner: Supposing the average number of sons born to the successive generations of Shem, Ham, and Japheth, to have been five, and supposing the average age at marriage to have been twenty-five years; allowing for no deaths, the male population of the earth one hundred and fifty years after the flood, or in the days of Rue, the son of Peleg, would be 312,500, which sum is obtained by simple process of geometrical progression, carried through six generations, the constant ratio being five, and then by adding together the several products—remembering that there were sixteen grandsons of Noah, to begin with.

It is easy to see that at the expiration of two hundred years, or about the time of Terah's birth, the population would be 7,812,500, or twice as many including females. The probability is that it was not less than this, even after making due allowance for deaths; especially when we take into consideration the facts that death-producing causes were not so numerous then,

on the Arabian side of the Persian Gulf. Elam, though geographically connected with the countries inhabited by their kinsfolk, had a population which spake agglutinative languages, and bore no ethnological relationship to the Semitic tribes of Babylonia and Assyria." The Philistines, according to the same writer, were a tribe of Phoenician extraction, who settled in Caphtor, the Egyptian Keftur, or "greater Phœnicia," a title given to the coast-land of the delta, in consequence of its large Semitic population, which had been established there at an early period. They were planted by the Pharaohs in the five cities of southern Palestine, in order to garrison the country for Egypt.—*Sunday School Times*, Jan. 15, 1887. See Am. ix. 7.

and the prolonged vigor and the great age to which man lived for several generations after the flood. And, indeed, an immense population is required, perhaps even greater than the above calculation gives, to meet the demands of the very ancient empires which Egyptian, Assyrian and Hittite inscriptions have brought to light. It is not possible, however, that such a rate of increase as we have supposed could have continued more than a few generations. As the race multiplied, war, famine and pestilence would find their way among men, and greatly check the growing population.

However incorrect the above figures may be, the illustration enables us to see that it was not merely a migratory whim, but a necessity as well, that caused mankind at a comparatively early period "to scatter abroad upon the face of all the earth." They carried with them the tradition of the flood, which rapidly became distorted, as it was repeated from mouth to mouth; and doubtless some of the tribes transformed Noah, its chief hero, whom they had never seen, into a god or demi-god long before his death. There is no conclusive reason for believing that Noah was unacquainted with the art of writing; but if he was acquainted with it, any account of the flood, or other events, which he may have put on permanent record, was inscribed on material too cumbersome to be disseminated among many readers, and equally as small a number would be reached by his oral instructions.

Shem lingered for the most part in the vicinity of the old home, his two sons, Ashur and Aram, giving their names to the closely neighboring countries of Assyria and Padan-Aram, or Syria. In the midst of their brethren of Ashur and Aram settled the lines of

Arphaxed and Lud. Elam's sons moved southward and gave their father's name to the country on the east bank of the Tigris opposite Babylonia. They developed into a tribe of considerable power, but were subsequently overrun by the Kissians, or Cushites. They preserved their tribal identity, however, and Chedorlaomer appears as their chieftain in the days of Abraham. (Gen. xiv, 1). Susa, or Shushan, became their capital city, and is thought to have been founded before the days of Chedorlaomer.

Colonies of Hamites were planted on the Orontes and the countries about Mount Lebanon. Kadesh became their western capital and Carchemish the eastern. These were the sons of Heth, the Hittites of the Bible, extensive colonies of whom were also made among other descendants of Ham in Canaan, and perhaps even as far south as Egypt*, this latter country, however, being settled chiefly by the posterity of Mizraim and Cush, the former of whom gave to it his name. Cushite settlements were also established in Southern Arabia, about the Persian Gulf, and along the lower Euphrates, though doubtless many Shemites had previously settled along the same river in the vicinity of its confluence with the Tigris. Possibly, indeed, the first principal Cushite settlement was made here in the lower Euphrates country, and that the Southern Arabic and African Cushites were offshoots from it. At any rate, both philological and ethnological data lead to the conclusion that Cushite colonies were established in Babylonia at a very early period, but whether before or after the Arabian and African settlements is a question which cannot be determined

*Wright's *Hittite Empire*.

with certainty. Gen. xi, 2 is not decisive, seeming to admit, as it does, of different interpretations. It may mean simply that they—these Cushites—journeyed forward, from whatever direction, and “found a plain in the land of Shinar,” the old name for Babylonia, where they settled. And doubtless there were gathered there adventurous spirits from other tribes than that of Cush, though it is not likely that either Noah or Shem was among them.

In connection with the Cushite settlements in Babylonia Nimrod first appears. He was the grandson of Ham. He was probably born not less than fifty years after the flood, though possibly more, as he was the son of Ham’s third son, Cush. He acted a conspicuous part in the history of his generation, and especially of his tribe, even as he has done still more conspicuously in subsequent fable. We do not know that Nimrod built the tower of Babel. This daring work, resulting in the supernatural “confusion of tongues” and the dispersion of those engaged in it, may have been wrought by his immediate predecessors, and his own small empire founded on the ruins of theirs. But this is the most probable view. Aside from the improbability of any settlements in the neighborhood prior to Nimrod being sufficiently strong to undertake such a work, local tradition has from time immemorial assigned a high tower to Nimrod, and there is no sufficient reason to believe that it is not the tower of Gen. xi.

We do not know when the tower was begun. It could scarcely have been more or less than two hundred years after the flood. At this time, as we have seen above, the total population of the earth would, on

a reasonable calculation, amount to several millions, and that of the district of country with which we are now concerned might amount to many thousands. At this time also, as men then lived, Nimrod would be in his prime. His physical prowess, and boldness, and enterprise of spirit would soon bring him to the front in those primeval times. He became a mighty hunter, first of beast and then doubtless of men, for perhaps the wild beasts since the flood had multiplied as rapidly as man had. He became a mighty hunter before Jehovah, the traditional meaning of which is *in defiance* of Jehovah, and there is yet no sufficient reason to discard this meaning. He was the Hercules of his day; and the power which he asserted over wild beasts would naturally soon be asserted over men.

The writer of Genesis informs us (Gen. x, 10) that the chief cities of his kingdom were Babel, Erech, Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar. The first of these is generally identified with the city afterwards called Babylon, and seems to have been the seat of the most active opposition to the God of Shem, which resulted in the miraculous introduction of such discord and confusion among them as doubtless greatly weakened the Cushite authority in that region. Although it is not known exactly at what time the "confusion of tongues" occurred, it is pretty clearly made out that the Cushite rule was displaced about the year 2,000 B. C., or 348 years after the flood, by the Shemitic, which continued as distinctly Shemitic, or Elamitic, or Arabian, until the year 1,300 B. C., or until about the time of Joshua's death. That the discord in Babel had something to do with the displacement of the Cushite rule we can only conjecture.

Erech, another of the principal cities of Nimrod, must be identified with the modern Harka, some eighty miles southeast from Babylon. The presence there of numerous mounds and remains of bricks and coffins indicates that it was the necropolis, perhaps of very ancient kings. Accad, the third Cushite, or Nimrodian city mentioned, is more difficult of identification. It was, without doubt, within the rather narrow limits of ancient Babylon, as the other three cities were. Rawlinson believes that the same city has been discovered in the inscriptions under the form of *Kinzi Akkad* (Rawl. Herod. i. 4, 49). He also thinks that the name "Akkad," or "Akkadian," was the name by which the great primitive Hamitic race who inhabited Babylonia from the earliest times called themselves, and "who originated the arts and sciences, and whose language was the great parent stock from which the trunk stream of the Shemitic tongues sprang." (Rawl. Herod. i. 319). Calneh is identified with the modern Niffer, about sixty miles southeast of Babylon, and may, instead of Babylon, have been the place where the great tower was built, and where Nimrod "endeavored to mount on eagles' wings to heaven." Thus the LXX. and Arabic tradition. Calneh, or Calno, is mentioned several times in the Scripture, and seems to have finally lost its prosperity eight or nine hundred years B. C.

But Nimrod seems to have been too ambitious to restrict his enterprise within the narrow limits of Shinar. He invaded the territory to the north, which bore the name of Shem's son Ashur, and which had been settled doubtless chiefly by the Shemites. It was more nearly in the vicinity of the original home of Noah and his

three sons. Here Nimrod founded, or enlarged, the cities of Nineveh, Calah, Rehoboth and Resen, which rapidly grew to be great cities, as the size of cities was then reckoned. Nineveh and Calah both became residences of the Assyrian kings long after Nimrod and his dynasty had departed; and both have furnished large proportions of the Assyrian remains at present in England. Mosul, on the river Tigris, is the modern name of Nineveh, while Calah is identified with the Nimrud remains about twenty miles distant.

But the empire of Nimrod crumbled 2000 years before Christ. He himself rapidly passed into fable, even as his parallel, Orion or Hercules, among the western sons of Japheth, did after him. On the ruins of his empire was gradually reared the confederacy of petty Semitic kingdoms mentioned in Genesis x, 10. The old Nimroidian cities of Babel, Erech, Accad and Calneh passed into the hands of Amraphal, who is called king of Shinar, and who, indeed, may have been a Cushite, but whose kingdom was small and lustreless, as compared with the former one of Nimrod. The lion-like Arioch held sway over the neighboring city of Ellasar; while Tidal, or Thurgal, was the great chief of various Shemitic and mixed tribes of both upper and lower Chaldea, who as yet laid claim to no well-defined territory. All these, and perhaps other petty kings, were united under the more powerful sway of Chedorlaomer, the Shemitic king of the country which bore the name of Shem's son, Elam, under whose leadership Canaan was invaded, and its chief cities, Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim reduced to subjection. Such is a brief sketch of the condition of political affairs in the chief Bible lands in the eighteenth century

before Christ, or about the time the Lord said unto Abraham, "Get thee out of thy country, and from among thy kindred, into a land which I will show thee." The theology and religion of the period remain to be discussed in the following sections.

§5. *Abraham Before His Call.*

It falls within our scope to treat of the patriarch Abraham at present only in brief, and chiefly before his appearance within the sphere of revelation, between which and the outside he is the connecting link.

Abraham, one branch of whose posterity became the depository of a permanent supernatural revelation, was born about three hundred and fifty years after the flood, or about the year of Noah's death. He was contemporary with Shem one hundred and fifty years, though we have no means of knowing whether he ever saw that patriarch. Abraham descended from Shem through the line of Arphaxad, the names of the intervening patriarchs being recorded for the important purpose of preserving the genealogical chain unbroken.

Abraham was most probably not the first, but the third son of Terah; and there is nothing intrinsically improbable in the old tradition that during forty years of his life he was contemporary with the great chieftain, Nimrod, and that he was the object of the latter's idolatrous persecution. We do not know where Abraham was born. The original seat of the tribe to which he belonged lay either on the border line of the territories called by the names of Ashur and Aram, or in southern Armenia, in the country known to the Greeks and Romans as Arrapachitis (a supposed corruption of

the name Arphaxad or Arpachshad). It lay immediately south of the modern city of Kars, and is to-day “a tangle of wild hills, rising often to great heights, but intersected by fruitful valleys.”

That either of these districts, however, was the native place of Abraham himself is not the most probable view. The family, or perhaps the tribe or clan to which he belonged had, before he was born, left the hill country of the north, and settled in the grassy plains of lower Chaldea, in the city, or in the vicinity of the city of Ur,—most probably identical with Mugheir, a city situated southeast of Babylon, and east of the Euphrates. It was one of the most ancient, and, at the time of Abraham, one of the most splendid cities of the territory which constituted the kingdom of Nimrod. The name “Ur” has been repeatedly found in the ruins of Mugheir, and the remains of an old temple—old even in Abraham’s time—are still to be seen there.

The life of Abraham in Chaldea seems, however, to have been more nearly contemporary with that of king Sargon I., one of the early Shemitic successors of Nimrod. Even at this early period the arts and sciences had begun to be cultivated. Astronomers were already watching the heavens; poets were composing hymns and epics; and patient scribes were stamping on soft clay tablets the books which have in part come down to our day. The remains of extensive libraries have been unearthed at Ur and several neighboring cities which date back to the time of Abraham. The accounts of the creation, flood, etc., given on a preceding page, are extracts from some of these tablet books.

Ur seems to have been the seat of an elaborate idolatry, the chief object of worship being the moon,

which was perfected and enforced by the powerful king, Sargon I. Here lived Terah and his tribe, outside of the city walls, doubtless, an influential sheik, leading his flocks and his herdsmen about the rich neighboring plains. Here Haran, his son, died. When he was advanced in years, he and his two sons, Nahor and Abraham, with their followers, moved gradually northward, and finally located at Charran, in Mesopotamia. Here Terah died at the age of two hundred and five years; after which Abraham, severing his connection forever with Nahor, his brother, emigrated with Lot, his nephew, and their herdsmen, to Canaan. At this time Abraham first appears within the sphere of revelation, being already seventy-five years of age.

CHAPTER II.

THE PRE-MOSAIC THEOLOGY AND RELIGION.

We must distinguish here, in the first place, between the points of doctrine and worship which were known in the pre-Mosaic ages, and those which were made known for the first time through Moses. And in the second place, we should also distinguish between the points of doctrine and worship as recognized by some members of the narrow lines of Seth and Shem on the one hand and mankind generally on the other.

§ 1. *Theology and Worship of the Antedeluvians.*

We are entirely ignorant, and must ever remain so, concerning the details of whatever system of faith and worship may have been in general vogue during the antedeluvian ages. God revealed himself to Adam and Eve both before and after the fall; and they rec-

ognized him as the Creator of the heaven and the earth and all things in them, and as the Being to whom they were morally responsible, and as One who had pledged that they and their posterity should be redeemed in some way, perhaps not well understood by them, from the evil which they themselves had introduced. This is evident from the Mosaic account of the fall, the discussion of which, however, belongs rather to the Mosaic period. But certain expressions occur in the first chapters of Genesis which may here be noticed, as they furnish us glimpses of the faith and practice of the peoples who lived many centuries before these chapters were written.

1. Gen. iv, 1. On the occasion of the birth of Cain, Eve speaks of the Divine Being by the significant covenant name of Jehovah, which fact indicates not the Jehovahistic authorship of Gen. iv, but Eve's knowledge of Jehovah's nearness and of the peculiar redemptive relation into which he had condescended to enter with man*. This is true, whether Eve thought she saw in the infant Cain the promised "seed of the woman," or not. Whether Eve actually used the very term "Jehovah" is a question of little importance, for the writer of Gen. iv, 1 evidently intends that we shall understand that she either said Jehovah, or a word of equivalent import of which Jehovah was the exact translation. If this be not true, language is not a reliable guide. If the chapter was indeed written by a Jehovahistic writer, then he put the word Jehovah into Eve's mouth because it was the only word which truly represented the idea in her mind.

*As we shall frequently be under the necessity of using the names Jehovah and Elohim in subsequent pages, it might as

2. Verses 3, 4. In the sacrifices of Cain and Abel we also see a recognition of the Divine Being, and of man's relation to him of dependence and responsibility; and though we have no further information concerning sacrifices until after the Flood—some sixteen centuries later—the very fact that they do then reappear in the Biblical history is some evidence that such symbolical recognition of human sinfulness and that there must in some way be a propitiation and a loving expression of gratitude, had not entirely disappeared prior to that event. As sacrifice is with strange accord the “central point in the religion of all ancient peoples,” so must it have been in the case of the antedeluvians. However totally the majority of these may have lost the knowledge of the true God, and abandoned all worship of him, there were perhaps always some who continued faithful in their allegiance to him.

3. Gen. iv, 26. This is another important passage in this connection. Here the name Jehovah occurs again, and in the same sense as above in the mouth of Eve. Then men began, or it was begun, to call upon the Divine Being by a name used then in the same sense as the name Jehovah was used at the time of the writer. We must suppose that this writer here em-

well be said here that: Jehovah in the Hebrew Bible designates the Divine Being regarded as standing in redemptive relation to his people; while the name Elohim, as contrasted with Jehovah, regards Him simply as the Deity or God of the world. The two terms, however, are often used interchangeably. By “Jehovistic author” is meant that supposed writer of a part of the Pentateuch who was partial to the use of the name Jehovah; the “Elohistic author” was another supposed writer who preferred the name Elohim,—suppositions which we do not think it necessary to adopt.

ployed the term Jehovah, not at all because he was the Jehovahistic author of the document in which this passage occurs, but that he employed it advisedly as the best theological representative of the word in actual use in the days of Enoch—which word in the particular connection referred to was neither Elohim nor its equivalent. The Divine Being was still recognized in this two hundred and fiftieth year from the creation of Adam, not merely as Creator, or not merely as Divinity, but also as One who stood in a particularly gracious relation to man.

The phrase “began to call upon” is, however, of more doubtful import, and its interpretation pertains not so much to the theology of the antedeluvians as to their morals and worship. Some exegetes have supposed it to mean that men at this time began to worship images as the representatives of the Divine Being whom they nevertheless recognized as Jehovah. This interpretation derives the word rendered in our version “to call upon” from a root which signifies to profane or dishonor. Thus the Targum, followed by some celebrated Jewish interpreters. The Septuagint reads, “Then he [Seth] hoped in Jehovah.” The Hebrew verb will also permit us to read, Then Seth, on the occasion of the birth of Enoch, called upon the name of Jehovah. But these views aside, “the language undoubtedly refers to a more general honoring of the name of Jehovah among the pious Sethites,” a more formal Divine worship having been instituted at the time.

4. Gen. v, 21–24 furnishes us another glimpse of primeval life. Enoch, who was born six hundred and twenty two years after Adam, walked with God (Elo-

him), and was not, for God (Elohim) took him. The use here of the name "Elohim" can be accounted for on other ground than that of a mere personal preference of the supposed "Elohistic writer" of this passage. The point in the statement is, not that Enoch was not *Jehovahless*, but that he was not *godless*; he not only recognized the Divine Being in his covenant or redemptive relation to man, but he also and especially lived a godly life in close practical communion with him. He was a man of exceptional and conspicuous piety. The statement implies that it had already ceased to be the rule for men "to walk with God," as Enoch did. Indeed, at the time of his translation, sixty nine years before Noah's birth, the dividing line was already passed, and the culminating point of antedeluvian wickedness was already being rapidly reached. The Sethites, who had hitherto been "the sons of God," were already identifying themselves by marriage with ungodly families. Enoch protested (Jude 14), and prematurely disappeared from among men, for God took him.

We can not, however, infer from the translation of Enoch that his contemporaries, as a rule, believed in the immortality of the soul, though they probably did to the same extent, and for the same reason, that all men do. But the recorded fact does imply an avowed belief in that doctrine on the part of the writer of the passage, but on the part of the contemporaries of Enoch only on the supposition that the information in regard to the translation reached the writer by tradition and not solely by direct revelation.

5. Gen, v, 28, 29. Sixty-nine years after the translation of Enoch Noah was born, Lamech his father,

therefore, being contemporary with Enoch one hundred and thirteen years. We know not to what extent Lamech, the grandson, had yielded to the good influence of pious Enoch the grandfather. But we know that the times had grown from bad to worse. Lamech's words, indeed, at the birth of his son indicate that God was still known, and known also by the more significant equivalent of Jehovah, though thus recognized perhaps only by a few Sethites. "This same [Noah, the new-born son] shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which Jehovah hath cursed." Lamech breathes a hope; perhaps in it there does not lurk a complaint against Jehovah on account of the hardship which he had imposed. But rather, "at so great an age," as Delitzsch says, "did these pious forefathers, who had renounced the self-created worldly lusts, confess their experience of the burden and painfulness, in all its gravity and in all its extent; and it is easily explained how it is that the history of the Sethites closes with language of such a different sound from that of the Cainites. [Gen. iv, 23, 24]. Lamech the Cainite is full of an evil drunken confidence. Lamech the Sethite, on the contrary, is filled with the most extreme dejection in respect to the present, and has no other joy than in the promise of the future." The name Noah means Rest, and "the confident hope of the wearied is ever some bringer of rest;" though it is noticeable that even Lamech says nothing of the moral or spiritual, but limits his hope exclusively to the restitution of the physical world: and how even this was in his view, to be achieved through Noah we can only conjecture. And yet we can scarcely so belittle the record as to

suppose that Lamech merely meant that in due time the labor of his new-born son should be substituted for his own, and that thereby he should find rest.

6. Gen. vi, 1-5. But in any event, Noah on account of his piety found favor with God in the midst of a world from which good had well nigh departed, and thereby became a more conspicuous factor in the restitution of the world than Lamech, in the utterance of his unconscious prophecy, had anticipated. These opening verses of Ch. vi very probably cover a long period of time prior to the great flood. The distinction between the Sethites and Cainites was long since obliterated for the most part. "The sons of God" and "the daughters of men," and the daughters of God and the sons of men, were thoroughly amalgamated by intermarriages. There were giants in wickedness, in those days; Nephilim, fallen or degenerate ones, who became mighty men of renown; and they were not of recent growth, but were of old, having increased in numbers for centuries before the flood. And the invention by Lamech the Cainite of tools and implements of metal must have given a fresh impetus to the exercise of their daring and self-seeking prowess.

"And Jehovah saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually;" which statement implies, not only that the evil was deep seated in the heart and violent in its outward expression, but that it was also universal. While Noah was perhaps not the only one who had the knowledge of the true God, he was practically the only one who persevered in his allegiance to him.

The light of the Church had become only a smoking wick. "The salt had lost its savor," and it was henceforth good for nothing but to be cast out. And so God destroyed the whole human race from off the face of the earth, with the exception of Noah and his family.

§ 2. *The Patriarchal Theology and Worship.*

Our study here includes the period of time from the deluge to Moses. The subject may be studied *first* as it presents itself outside of the sphere of revelation; *second*, as it presents itself within that sphere.

1. *Outside the Sphere of Revelation.*

1. The doctrine of God. The doctrine that God is one, and the only one, was lost and found again. All the pre-Mosaic peoples, including even those of the line of Shem, seem to have become polytheists at a very early period, perhaps even before the death of Noah. The impress of polytheism is stamped indelibly even on the Hebrew language. It was, in its earliest rudiments, a heathen language long before it became the vehicle of a supernatural revelation. The word Elohim, the word designating the Being to whom revelation assigns the creation of the heaven and the earth, is a plural term; and as such it was used before revelation appropriated it to its own purpose, and injected into it a new meaning.

The transition from the original monotheism of Noah must have been gradual, but it was nevertheless rapid and widespread. We learn even from Josh. xxiv, 2 that the immediate ancestors of Abraham were polytheists, though Abraham himself was probably,

while yet in Chaldea, not so entirely committed to the worship of other gods as were his fathers. It is probable, also, that by a few others who remained under the more immediate influence of Noah and Shem a lingering trace of monotheism was retained. But for the most part the primitive monotheism derived from the primeval revelation made to mankind, "was by degrees overlaid and hidden under a cloud of invented deities, originally attributes or manifestations of the one Supreme Being, but rapidly tending to detach themselves, and to become [regarded as] separate personalities." (Rawlinson). The sun, moon, planets, and various phenomena of nature were deified, and an elaborate system of idolatry prevailed in all Bible lands even prior to the migration of Abraham.

2. Worship: The common form of worship among the Canaanites and Shemitic peoples in the farther east was that of sacrifices. The custom of offering human victims became prevalent among these races at an early period. If the sacrifice of a brute animal would be acceptable to the god, that of a human being, it was thought, would be propitiatory in a still higher degree. The more valuable the victim, the more agreeable would be the ascending savor—a conclusion easy to reach, but founded on a misconception of the divine Being, and of the true nature of a virtuous action. Sacrifices as expressions of gratitude were also offered.

3. The future life: The pre-Mosaic peoples, particularly the Egyptians, held a very clear, definite and precise belief in the doctrines of a future existence and a judgment of all men after death according to their works. In the midst of these teachings Moses and the

Hebrews grew up. It is not probable, therefore, that the reticence of Moses on these subjects was intentional and premeditated. The features of the future life as believed in by the Egyptians were not such as an inspired teacher could sanction. "An Egyptian, at the judgment, was supposed to appear before the assessors of Osiris, and to deny wholly that he had ever committed any of the forty-two sins of the Egyptian sacred code. I have not blasphemed; I have not deceived, stolen, slain any one treacherously; I have not been cruel, idle, drunken," etc. The whole Egyptian belief on the subject of the dead was so inseparably bound up with the prevalent polytheism, worship of ancestors and sun-worship, that a prudent legislator, like Moses (to say nothing of his being under divine guidance), having to legislate for a people so wholly accustomed to material tendencies, and greatly inclined to idolatry, might well hesitate to lend any countenance to views in which the false and the true, the elevating and the degrading were inseparably intermixed, and might be wise in determining to leave the future life in the vagueness and the mystery from which the daring speculations of the Egyptian priests had withdrawn it, and concentrate men's attention on that present life which is their immediate concern, and the rightful conduct of which is the best preparation for whatever existence God designs them to lead in the life to come.

The theological and religious state in the far east had long been no better than in Egypt. There is good reason for believing that the life of Abraham in Chaldea was nearly, if not quite, contemporary with a great religious revolution which one of the early kings

effected throughout all Babylonia. Till then the mingled Accadians and Sumirs (inhabitants of Shinar) had followed a simple nature-worship, different in each town or district, and had not as yet grouped their local divinities into a graduated celestial hierarchy. Their religion, indeed, consisted chiefly in meagre rites; their ideas of the gods were vague and indefinite. But two thousand years before the Christian era the mythology was already completed, and its deities definitely connected into a system which continued with little change down to the close of the kingdom. New divinities and a cruel worship displaced forever the faith of earlier times. In the midst of such religious influences as these was Abraham, the faithful, brought up.

II. *Within the Sphere of Revelation.*

1. (a). With Noah God resumes the development of his purpose of salvation by the seed of the woman. However meagre may have been his knowledge of God and of his purpose of salvation, and of divine things in general, it was sufficiently definite to enable him to become at once the starting point of this new development. He was the recipient of direct revelation from God, and, so far as we know, he was the only one who was, until the time of Abraham. But Noah lived three hundred and fifty years after the flood, and during this interval may have been the recipient of frequent, though unrecorded revelations. Hence the knowledge of the true God, and of his purpose in regard to the human race, might be preserved within the narrow circle of Noah's own personal influence and instruction. That this circle was necessarily a limited one must be admitted, though it by no means follows that Noah

and his immediate posterity were destitute of the art of writing.

The question as to how Noah could identify any given revelation of which he might be the recipient as a revelation from the true God, can be answered only by saying it was a matter of faith, or religious conviction. The fact, indeed, that faith must necessarily be the subjective condition of a supernatural revelation would limit this revelation to a select few, whose degree of religious aptitude rendered them open to its reception; and it would also tend to weaken any tradition of such revelation the farther this tradition might proceed from its original source. All men have never possessed in an equal degree an acute and sensitive religious instinct; and it is probable that Noah himself was more susceptible of supernatural revelations at some periods of his life than he was at others. His faith, like that of other good men, might not be uniformly of the same strength and vividness, nor the religious sentiment in him uniformly lively. Such considerations as these may serve to explain, in part, at least, the rapid and general growth of heathenism during the first two or three centuries after the flood; though it is not probable that their knowledge ever ceased to be in advance of their morality.

(b.) The development of the divine purpose of salvation, which began anew with Noah, had its starting point on the human side in the *sacrifices* which Noah offered shortly after his exit from the ark; these being an outward confession both of his sinfulness and of his belief that God would fulfill his purpose. We are not required to suppose, however, that he thoroughly understood the nature and extent of this promised re-

demption, or the manner in which it would be wrought out.

On the part of God the starting point is the *acceptance* by him of the offered sacrifice of Noah, and the *promise*, "I will not again curse the ground," etc., Gen. viii. 21, 22. The result of the sacrifice and its acceptance is, God enters into a new covenant, or rather, resumes his former covenant with the race, in virtue of which he again bestows on man at least a partial dominion over nature, and the blessing of perpetuating his species, and "gives him a preliminary law to be their first elementary school-master": "Whosoever sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed"—in which there may be an allusion to the lawless violence and irreverent disregard of human life which were so rife in the days before the flood. The rain-bow is made to serve as the permanent and ever-visible witness of this solemn transaction.

On account, however, of the rapid encroachments of heathenism it is probable that this whole transaction became in the course of a few generations a greatly distorted tradition; so that its greatest value is secured by the fact that it was afterwards made a matter of inspired record. The incident related in Gen. ix, 21–23 is a matter of ethics, in regard to which it is probable that Noah's practice was on a level with his knowledge. His conduct may not have been wrong, judged by the only standard of morality to which he had as yet attained. His heart was doubtless more nearly right than his life.

2. (a). With the call of Abraham began a new era in the Divine process of revelation and redemption. It is necessary that there should be an historical basis to

the work of salvation, for otherwise the race could be neither instructed nor saved. To this end, therefore, an *individual* was chosen who could become, after Noah, the second starting point. Mankind generally were already too far enveloped in the falling fog of heathenism for it to be possible to save the race in any other way than by a method of historical particularism. To counteract the prevailing wickedness, to preserve for himself a people to whom his word and ordinances might be committed, and among whom his worship might be perpetuated, God selected Abraham rather than one of his contemporaries doubtless because he had not yielded so far to the encroachments of heathenism; perhaps also because of his more sensitive religious nature and livelier faith in the God of Noah; perhaps also because there was that in him generally, as respected both his character and circumstances, which rendered him more open to the call as well as more submissive to the discipline which it implied; or, in short, because he was in all respects the most available man for the purpose which God had in view.

The call was a subjective one, of course, being communicated to Abraham through the medium, not of his external, but of his inward and spiritual faculties. He rightly regarded the call as from the God whom he worshipped, because he could account for it in no other way, and his ready obedience to it was due to his faith and other elements of his religious nature. It is worthy of notice, however, that it is the writer of Genesis who simply informs us that the call was the call of God, but he does not say that Abraham at this stage of his spiritual growth was certain in his own

mind that it was such. Hence, so far as the Genesis record goes, we are at liberty to believe that Abraham, at this period of his advancement, was merely acting under what may have seemed to him to be the pressure of circumstances, or in view of what he supposed to be for the best, not being by any means certain in his own mind that God was behind the voice calling him to the fulfillment of a great destiny. But great souls may have great forecastings, and those of Abraham became more and more vivid, and were more and more distinctly recognized by him as divine. In after years he could look back over his past and identify the hand which had led him as the hand of God, and the early whisperings which he had as the voice of God, while he may by no means have clearly perceived them to be so when he himself was back in that past. In this respect his experience finds its parallel in the life of many a Christian. He was one of the numerous worthies who walk by faith and not in the bright light of conscious knowledge.

(b). But whatever might be the details of the future of himself and his posterity, which was perhaps as yet a vague dream to him, Abraham knew that his mission could not be fulfilled in his own country and among his kindred; because *first*, it would be more difficult for him to avoid idolatry living among his old associates than it would be among strangers. It is probable also that Church and State in Chaldea were united in his day, and that the idolatrous worship of more than one god was required and enforced by the sovereign. *Second*, had he retained his connection with his country and kindred, he would have been no more than one link in the chain,—no more in history

than Nahor, or Terah, or Eber. He would have been absorbed by his surroundings, and could not have become the father of a "peculiar people." If such considerations as these were in the mind of Abraham strengthening his conviction that it would be best for him to remove to a land of strangers and of greater religious liberty, where he could worship the Divine Being according to the dictates of his own conscience, it only argues that there was in him a remarkable natural basis for the supernatural revelations of which he was to be the recipient. And such natural basis was necessary, for not every man could have become an Abraham.

(c). But the call implied a promise; for without the latter, the former would have been meaningless, and hence to Abraham the same as no call. There can be no call, unless it be to the realization of something, and this something to be realized is the promise. Hence the promise, which in the verbal statement follows the call, is in reality the chief element of the call. The other elements were the desire which was, providentially or otherwise, awakened to realize the promise or vision of the future which was vouchsafed, and the accompanying conviction that he ought to realize it. "I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing. And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed."—Gen. xii. 2-3. Viewed from the standpoint of the writer who afterward recorded it, this promise meant one thing; viewed from the standpoint of Abraham himself, it may have meant quite a different, though not a contradictory

thing. Before we can know just how it appeared to him, we must know more of his religious and theological status. Perhaps it was, at first, to him a divinely produced, but as yet only a vague presentiment, growing daily into a stronger conviction, until at last he could say with confidence that the whispering within him was truly the voice of God. "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should afterward receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went."—Heb. xi. 3. The only thing that was clear to him was his sense of duty. The only media through which the divine voice could reach him were his conscience and his faith—even his conscience, however, being in a measure dependent upon his faith. Whatever visible theophany, or other form of miracle, there may have been from time to time, even it could appeal only to his faith; for unless he had believed it to be a miracle, it could not have been such to him. But faith cannot leap at one bound to its highest strength and purity. There must be a sub-stratum of experience and other forms of instruction and discipline to serve as the basis of each new requirement and endeavor. The fact that the writer of Genesis records the promise several successive times implies, not that Abraham's original conviction as to his mission was waning, but that it was continually present in his mind, and that every once and a while an incident occurred to strengthen it. It is a story of growth, related according to the order of nature. Had his conviction or premonition of his future ever utterly disappeared from his mind, the fact would have been equivalent to a renunciation of his mission.

(d). But neither Abraham's theology nor his religion was at first perfect; nor is it likely that either became so during his life. Of the latter his faith was the least imperfect element. He believed in God, and he believed more and more strongly that He had called him to be the initial factor in the accomplishment of a great mission*. But this does not imply that either his knowledge of God, or of all that constitutes a system of religion, was perfect. Had his knowledge of either been perfect, he could not have felt it to be his duty to sacrifice Isaac as a burnt offering, because he could not have felt himself divinely called to do so. It was a Divine call, but it had to be based, in the first place, on Abraham's partial ignorance of the true character of the Divine Being and of the relation in which this Being and himself stood to each other; and, in the second place, on Abraham's familiarity with human sacrifices as practiced by the people among whom he then lived, as well as by those among whom he had lived while in Chaldea.† We do not know

*Dean Milman thus summarizes the Abrahamic conception of God: I. His unity and almighty ness. He is the Lord of heaven and earth (Gen. xiv, 19). He disposes of future events. One of his [Abrahamic] names implies almighty ness [El-Shaddai]. II. His immateriality. His communication with Abram is by a voice [whether heard with the outward ear or in the inner man or in vision]. His apparition (Gen. xiv, 8 18), is without form. The symbol is that which is least material—the fire or the smoke cloud. III. His active Personality. He is more than a power or force, or law; he is a Being with a will, with moral attributes, revealing himself more or less distinctly, and holding communication, not only as an overruling influence on material things, but with the inward consciousness of man.—*History of the Jews*.

†As to the question, How could God command Abraham to kill Isaac? two considerations, says Dr. Alexander McLaren, deserve attention. First, the final issue, namely: Isaac's deliv-

how long the question whether he should offer Isaac was on his mind; but in any case the greatest obstacle in the way of ready obedience was his natural affection. He doubtless shared, however, the common belief of his contemporaries, that the greater the degree of self denial involved, the greater the degree of Divine favor which he would secure. It is on this imperfect religious and theological status that the Divine call to sacrifice Isaac is based; for, what I believe that God requires me to do depends very largely on what sort of a Being I believe God to be; as much on this, perhaps, as on my previously formed idea of my right to do this or that,—deprive my child of its life, for instance.

Whatever may at first have been Abraham's own view on the subject, it is to be observed in this instance, that the call is made not because the Divine Being really desired human sacrifices, but for the very reason, in part, that he did not approve of them. Con-

erance was an integral part of the Divine purpose from the beginning of the trial; so that the question really is, Was it accordant with the Divine character to require readiness to sacrifice even a son at his command? Second, that in Abraham's time a father's right over a child's life was unquestioned, and that therefore this command, though it lacerated Abraham's heart, did not wound his conscience as it would do were it heard to-day. It is impossible to conceive of a Divine injunction such as this being addressed to us. We have learned the inalienable sacredness of every life, and the awful prerogative and burden of individuality. God's command cannot enforce sin. But it was not wrong in Abraham's eyes for a father to slay his son; and God might shape his message to the form of the existing morality without derogation to his character, especially when the result of the message would be, among other things, to teach his abhorrence of human sacrifices, and so to lift the existing morality to a higher level.

sidering Abraham's familiarity with such sacrifices, which he had, perhaps, been accustomed to regard as a matter of course, the only way whereby he might be set right was to cause him to think about it as a personal matter. The only way in which God could speak to him was through the medium of his thoughts and surroundings; and the very moment Abraham reached the definite conclusion that Isaac ought to be sacrificed, and that he actually would sacrifice him, that very moment it was to him a divine call, and that very moment the deed was virtually done. Not only was it in his estimation a divine call, but it was so in reality, for that was the very conclusion to which God desired to lead him, though it was not the thing which he desired him actually to do. To Abraham the virtual sacrifice of his son was an immense triumph of his faith, while at the same time he reached the definite conviction that literal human sacrifices were not the thing which God desired. His faith had leaped forward and upward, and henceforth he was far in advance of his former theological and religious status. His knowledge of God and of the manner in which he should be worshipped was such as to render it unnecessary for him ever again to be called on to make a personal matter of the question of human sacrifices.

(e). But the question: What degree of significance did bloody sacrifices of any sort have in the estimation of Abraham himself? is not easily answered. Abraham's contemporaries were familiar with these sacrifices, as he himself was, and it is not probable that he attached a larger significance to them than they did. But it was a different quality of significance, doubtless, due to his livelier faith, his more sensitive religious

nature, his purer and more advanced ideas in regard to the Divine Being, and to the above-mentioned premonitions which he had all along in regard to the mission and destiny of his people. To him who regarded God, not as a tutelary Deity, one among many, but as the Most High, the just Judge of the whole earth, and therefore the Only One, and holy, sacrifices were somewhat different from, and better than, what they could otherwise have been. They may not have been types in the usual sense of that term, but they surely were memorials to him of God's purpose of redemption, and as such he offered them, and thereby gave proof of his faith in that purpose. The promise made in Eden still whispered in his bosom, and he looked forward and saw the day of Christ, not in its details and fullness, perhaps, but as being in some way the fulfillment and consummation of a saving purpose and plan.

(f). But Abraham grew in religious experience, and by the Divine Spirit and Providence became more and more confirmed in his convictions as to the part he and his posterity should have in the working out of the Divine purpose; that which in his own heart had been a mere conviction more or less strong, but on the part of God was a real promise, assumed the form of a solemn covenant. This covenant amounts on the side of Abraham to a full committal of himself and at least one branch of his posterity to the mission which he feels to be set before them, and concerning which there could no longer be any doubt. Inasmuch as the matter of the mission is now settled once for all, it is plain that there should be to the human party to it a perpetual and distinctive reminder of it; and which should at

the same time also serve as a perpetual bond of union and token that God would contribute his part to the fulfillment of the covenant. But the question why circumcision should have been chosen as such memorial cannot, perhaps, be answered satisfactorily to all. Perhaps a distinctive sign was needed. Circumcision does not seem to have been practiced by the people among whom Abraham then lived, and it is by no means certain that it was practiced by any contemporary nation. Or, if it be supposed that Abraham was familiar with the rite, as the language of Gen. xvii, 1 may seem to some to imply, perhaps such a token was needed as the people might observe or might not observe, thereby perpetually reminding them that the fulfillment in themselves of the covenant depended in part on themselves. In this case a previously known practice might well serve as a token, just as a previously existing natural phenomenon, the rainbow, served as the sign of the covenant with Noah. In that instance it was a natural phenomenon wholly beyond human control, for the fulfillment of the covenant as then made does not depend on the faithfulness of any particular line or family. But here its fulfillment in the Abrahamic family is made to depend on the voluntary faithfulness of that family. Hence the sign which they might observe or neglect.

(g). God afterwards by his Spirit impressed the same matters on the hearts of Isaac and Jacob, who had doubtless also received faithful instruction from Abraham. These with greater or less degree of faithfulness performed their various duties, teaching the worship of the true God to their domestics, and communicating it in turn to their posterity.

(h). In regard to the polygamy of these patriarchs, that is a matter of ethics. But it may be observed here, that as they were not suddenly inducted to the highest knowledge of God, nor indeed could be, so they were not and could not be suddenly inducted to the practice of the highest morality. Men's perceptions of right and wrong are known to depend very largely on the state of society in which they live. The moral law itself is immutable, but one's idea of what is moral or immoral grows with his growth. And while the Bible nowhere approves, but everywhere tacitly or expressly disapproves of polygamy, it is yet possible to conceive of circumstances under which it would be much less injurious every way than would be with us. Such extenuating circumstances may have existed to a certain extent with the patriarchs. Still, it was an evil, and the Hebrews were ultimately led to its abandonment.

DIVISION II.

THE MOSAIC PERIOD.

Definition.

In this division we study the institutions and doctrines of the Mosaic times; or rather, the religion of Israel, as exhibited in their history, institutions and beliefs. This is commonly called Mosaism, Moses being by far the most conspicuous and influential leader and teacher of this period. Chronologically, it embraces only the period of time from the exodus of Israel from Egypt to the entrance into Canaan, for during this period the system was perfected. The other three Pentateuchal ages, viz: the antedeluvian, the Noachic and the patriarchal, are to be regarded as introductory to this, and not as a part of it. The theological and religious contents of these ages are in no sense a part of Mosaism, only in as far as they furnish theological and religious contributions thereto. To determine, therefore, the doctrinal and religious ground-work or basis of Mosaism; or, in other words, to distinguish that which Mosaism had to begin with, is the first object of our present study.

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORICAL AND DOCTRINAL BASIS OF THIS PERIOD.

§1. Historical Basis.

The historical facts which Mosaism presupposes, and upon which it is reared, find their starting point in the call of Abraham; and this in turn is based on the divine purpose, ever present in the divine mind, of redeeming

the race from sin and sin's effects. The covenant with Abraham is only a new phase of the covenant made with Noah, and this again is only a new phase of the covenant with Adam (Gen. iii. 15). The nature and general significance of the case of Abraham, considered from Abraham's own point of view, have already been briefly dwelt upon. The promise involved in the call (Gen. xii. 2, 3) was only the resumption, continuation, and further unfolding of the blessing given to his ancestor, Shem (Gen. ix, 26, 27), with which it is likely that Abraham was acquainted. The servitude to which Caanan had been condemned reappears in the words: "*Unto thy* seed will I give this land;" and, together with the prophecy concerning Shem (that Elohim should dwell in his tents), the curse becomes a blessing given to Abraham, while the words: "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed," is only another way of including not only the descendants of Japheth within the scope of the promise, but also all other nations, even the Hamitic, which do not refuse the blessing offered through the medium of Abraham's race. The words of this promise, even strictly construed, admit of application to the personal Messiah, the great Redeemer of the race; but it is not necessary here to construe them as having, in the mind of Abraham and his immediate descendants, such personal reference. It is quite conceivable, it is true, that Abraham in respect to his ideas was far in advance of his age; but it must also be regarded as true that the highest meaning put upon the covenant words, for some centuries yet, was that a great good was meant, a blessing involving salvation, though the precise way in which it should be wrought out was not yet fully understood.

by the mass of the covenant people, if indeed it was by the few who received special revelations. It is not unlikely that the promise was so far misunderstood by many as to cause them to regard Abraham himself as the medium of the salvation, so that to be a descendant of him through Isaac and Jacob was itself a sufficient pledge of the blessing; while, therefore, the salvation in any given case may have been a matter of the future, the Saviour was one, not to be expected, but rather retrospected, the only thing needful to be sure about being the matter of personal pedigree. It was always known to the Divine mind, of course, as we ourselves now know that "the seed of the woman," and "seed of Abraham" was in the highest sense the Christ the Son of God; but doubtless the most that was known about it in the early ages of the Old Testament Church was that the restoration should be effected in some way through the medium of the same human nature that had been the medium of the ruin. Abraham had several children by his wives Keturah and Hager; but not in these was the promise to find its fulfillment; not out of the posterity of these was the "peculiar nation" to be organized which should be the medium of the accomplishment of the Divine purpose. In Isaac, not merely because he was the child of his old age, and therefore his most beloved, not merely because he was the son of Sarah, but because he was the child of his father's faith and of miracle, should his seed be called. The fact that Isaac was the child of miracle was important as a pledge to Abraham, for while it was due in part to his faith, it yet in turn greatly increased his faith, but it was even of more importance to the after ages of the chosen race as

being to them a perpetual Divine testimonial, as well as a proof that faith is ever necessary on the part of those who would possess the Divine favor. Of Isaac's two sons, Esau is excluded, or rather excluded himself, and Jacob becomes the one from whom the nation should proceed, which should be the medium of unfolding and accomplishing the redemptive purpose. The twelve tribes, as they were afterwards called, bore the names of Jacob's twelve sons, none of whom either socially or politically strayed beyond the limits of the covenant as did Esau; though this does not imply on their part either the practice of a purer morality or the possession of a livelier faith than characterized Esau. The circumstance that held the twelve sons together was the train of providential events which led in the first place to the return from Padan-Aram, and in the second place, to the settlement of the whole family in Egypt. In all these circumstances they themselves were factors, though without any reference whatever to the Divine purpose, to the fulfillment of which they were unconsciously contributing. Doubtless, however, the patriarch Jacob already anticipated the organization of his posterity into a nation and their return to Canaan, for he provides on his deathbed for the transportation of his body thither; and he had doubtless, as the old prophecy of Gen. xv, 13, 16, proceeded towards its fulfillment, implanted in his sons more and more of the same faith. The voluntary settlement in Egypt became a period of bondage which is passed over in the biblical account for the most part in silence. But meanwhile the family grows not only in numbers, but also in its distinctness as a people. During the closing years of the period their condition

becomes more and more degraded and servitude more and more severe; the providential design of this is two-fold. *First*, the unification of the people. Nothing so binds together as a common suffering. *Second*, to prepare them for the exodus from Egypt and the return to Canaan, which comes at last, Moses, one of their own number, being the agent through whom it is effected. The next step is the formal organization of the people into a nation, which takes place at Sinai.

§2. *Historical Basis Continued: Moses.*

Moses is the character who first appears as the organizer, the law-giver, and also the representative of the Israelitish nation. "To the outer heathen world the earlier period of the Hebrew race, with the single exception of Abraham, was an entire blank. Their origin in the far East, their first settlement in Canaan, the name of their first father, whether Jacob or Israel, these were all but unknown to the Greeks and Romans. It is the Exodus that reveals the Israelite to the eyes of Europe. Egypt was the only land which the Gentile inquiries recognized as the birth-place of the Jews." Here Moses was born about one hundred and thirty years after the first settlement of the Hebrews in Egypt, and about sixty-five years after the death of Joseph. He was the son of Amram and Jocebed, of the tribe of Levi. The circumstances of his birth and early infancy are given in Ex. ii. He was reared as the adopted son of the King's daughter, and thus became "learned in the wisdom of the Egyptians;" and was thus, on the human side, at least, only the better prepared for the great mission that lay before him. He became, also, mighty "in deed" as well as in word.

After mentioning the circumstances of his birth, the writer passes over in silence the first forty years of life. During these years he has been regarded as an Egyptian rather than a Hebrew. According to Jewish and Egyptian tradition, he was educated at Heliopolis, and grew up there as a priest, under his Egyptian name of Osarsiphor Tisethen. He learned arithmetic, geometry, music, medicine, astronomy and grammar. He is also said to have invented boats and engines for building, "instruments of war and hydraulics, hieroglyphics, and division of lands." He taught Orpheus, and was hence called by the Greeks "Museus," and by the Egyptians "Hermes*". He was sent on an expedition against the Ethiopians, whom he conquered, getting rid of the serpents of the country to be traversed by letting loose baskets full of ibises, which devoured them. The city of Hermopolis was believed to have been founded to commemorate his victory. He re-named the conquered capital "Meroe," from the name of his adopted mother, whom he is said to have buried there. He married the daughter of the Ethiopian king, and returned with her in triumph to Egypt. But whatever may have been the honors which he achieved, and those which may have belonged to him by right, not merely as the protege, but as the adopted son of the king's daughter, he voluntarily renounced them all, "choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt;" which of itself argues that he was a truly strong character, and had a pro-

*Artapanus in Eusebius, quoted by Stanley, *Jewish Church*, Sec v.

found conception of the mission of his people, and a profound insight into their future. This conception and insight were the expansion by the Holy Spirit, doubtless, of seeds implanted in his breast by his mother-nurse; though the words quoted from the Epistle to the Hebrews, viz.: "esteeming the reproach of Christ," are not necessarily to be so construed as to teach that Moses at this time received a revelation concerning the personal Messiah. He believed thoroughly the theocratic promises made to his fathers, which was equivalent to believing in a personal Christ of the New Testament, though Moses at the time may not have known this. It is possible to accept a proposition as true, even to the extent of staking one's life upon its truth, and yet not be aware of all the truth as involved in the proposition.

Moses having reclaimed his Hebrew nationality, the circumstances leading to his exile in Midian, beyond the jurisdiction of the Egyptian authorities, are briefly related in Ex. ii, 11-15. The only inspiration that impelled Moses to slay the Egyptian was the inspiration of passionate impulse, though this passionate impulse and quickness of action were founded, not so much upon the Egyptian training he had received, as upon the fact that he committed himself to the cause of his people, and had resolved to make their future his own. But he was too fresh from court, and the people were not yet ready; and the only way of delivering them had not yet developed; and even Moses cannot anticipate his own Divine call. So he has to flee the country, and receive a schooling amid the solitudes of exile, which was no less important to him than that which he had received in the cloisters of Heliopolis and

in the court circle and armies of Egypt. During his forty years in Midian he became thoroughly acquainted with the country and the tribes and the language which they spoke, and identified by marriage with a tribal prince, who could afterward lend valuable aid; and the opportunity, amid the silent grandeur of the desert and the mountains, while keeping the flocks of Jethro, for meditation, reflecting upon the past of his people, and gathering up their traditions and the promises concerning them; casting, doubtless, many a longing look to their future. God and man can best commune with each other amid the unbroken solitudes. In this way Moses is prepared for the revelation made to him by the Voice which spoke from the bush which burned but was not consumed. His mind had previously dwelt much on the subject, otherwise no revelation could have been made to him, any more than it could have been made to Jethro or one of the Amalekites. Supernatural revelation implies a natural basis, according to the usual Divine mode of working. But Moses at first shrinks. It is always easier to contemplate a great mission at a distance than it is once for all to commit one's self to it. But meanwhile corresponding preparations for the yet unhoped-for exodus have been quietly making in Egypt. The old king, from whom Moses had fled, is dead. The oppression of the Hebrews has not become less rigidly severe. Some degree of hope of better things had begun to be awakened in the hearts of the people by Aaron, the tribe of Levi and the family of Amram, in particular, being truer both to the past and to the future of the chosen people than any other of the tribes.

Nor would Moses himself, on his return, be any

longer known as an Egyptian, and regarded as one who was false to his nationality. The very fact that they now cried unto God (Ex. ii, 23) in the severity of their servitude, implies that they were now in the attitude to be saved "as one man," and that faith is beginning to be born in them. Affliction had ripened them for redemption, and they soon saw signs and heard words which they could not gainsay.

Meanwhile Aaron had direct Divine intimation that his brother was in the vicinity of Horeb, and that he must meet him there. He found him at the designated place, and kissed him, according to Eastern custom. They had not seen each other for forty years, perhaps, but their minds had dwelt on the same theme. They talked the matter over (Ex. xii, 28) thoroughly and alone, amid the shadows of the mountains of God, and, returning to Egypt along the route which afterward they should traverse under different circumstances, they enter at once upon their arduous mission of delivering, organizing and leading the people from Egypt to the land of promise. And they succeeded.

NOTE.—For the testimony of Josephus concerning Moses and the Egyptian traditions given by him, see Jos. *against Apion*, Bk. i, 26–32, and Jos. *Antiq.* Bks. ii and iii. Strabo's testimony is as follows: "Moses, an Egyptian priest, who possessed a considerable tract of Lower Egypt, unable longer to bear what existed there, departed thence to Syria, and with him went out many who honored the Divine Being. For Moses maintained and taught that the Egyptians were not right in likening the nature of God to beasts and cattle, nor yet the Africans, nor even the Greeks, in fashioning their gods in the form of men. He held that this only was God—that which encompasses all of us, earth and sea, that which we call Heaven, and the Order of the world, and the Nature of things. Of this, who that had any sense would venture to invent an image like anything which exists among ourselves? Far better to abandon all statuary and

sculpture, all setting apart of sacred precincts and shrines, and to pay reverence without any image whatever. The course prescribed was, that those who have the gift of good divinations, for themselves or for others, should compose themselves to sleep within the temple; and those who live temperately and justly may expect to receive some good gift from God, these always, and none besides.—*Strabo*, xvii, 760.

§3. *Doctrinal Basis.*

Mosaism also presupposes certain doctrines, in their rudiments, at least, if not in their fully developed forms. It is a mistake to suppose that the Israelites at the time of their exodus from Egypt were a rude race of people altogether destitute of even the beginnings of culture. However long and severe their servitude may have been, it is evident that their will had not been crushed, for abundant proof is not wanting that even under slight provocations they were quick to assert their opinions and preferences. It is not supposable, even in the absence of other evidence to the contrary, that so spirited a people would fail to retain much of their ancestral religion, and also at the same time fail to absorb much from their surroundings. The remembrance of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had doubtless to some extent faded from the minds of many of the people, and we learn unmistakably from the incident of the golden calf, Ex. xxxii, and from such passages as Lev. xvii, 7; xviii, 21; Ezek. xx, 6-9; xxiii, 8, 19, that the pure worship of God which had obtained among the patriarchs, had been displaced by idol-worship. But the traditions of another God, and another worship, and a promised future still lingered. Moses had these as a vantage ground to begin with, and on which to base his appeals and his instructions. The doctrinal status of the Is-

raelites previous to and at the time of the exodus may be briefly exhibited as follows:

1. The Israelitish doctrine of God at this period of their history was partly an inheritance, partly an absorption from their surroundings, and partly as a matter of Divine revelation communicated to them through Moses. But the Egyptian system of theology was never to any considerable extent adopted by the Israelites, however much their religious practices may have been influenced thereby. They were not only Semites, but also Hebrews; and these two facts they could not have forgotten had they been so disposed. The Semitic conception of the Divine Being antecedent to, and current among the Hebrews during the early Mosaic time, can not be adequately understood apart from a consideration of the names by which he was known. The most general of these designations were El, Eloah, Elohim, El Elyon, El Shaddai, and the later and exclusively Hebrew name, Jehovah. Of these names El is the oldest. It means the Mighty One, being allied to the verb *ul* which signifies to be strong. In the primitive Semitic conception of God power was the dominant factor. He was not chiefly the self-existent One, nor the just, nor the merciful, but the One who had power and could wield it. The problem of existence and the ethical ideas of justice, mercy, etc., were not the subjects which engaged the chief thought of primeval man. His first material was furnished through the medium of his physical senses. As applied to the true God within the sphere of revelation, the name El is never found alone, but always in connection with the definite article, or other adjunct that restricts its meaning; as (e. g.) Gen. xiv,

18, 19, 20, 22, where it is limited by the adjective "most high," the corresponding phrase in the Hebrew being El Elyon. The English reader is familiar with the word in such old proper names as Mehuja-el, Methusa-el, Beth-el, etc. This word was in common use at the time of the exodus, and continued to be during the subsequent periods of Hebrew history. But in as much as every nation had its own peculiar, or tutelary, god, the term was as applicable to one as to another, and hence when applied to him who was regarded as the true God, the God above all gods, it had to be restricted in the manner above described. Hence to Isaac he reveals himself not merely as El, or Elohim—this latter term having the same general and indefinite application as the former; but he reveals himself to Isaac as the El of Abraham, and to Jacob as the El of Abraham and Isaac, and subsequently as the El of thy fathers, the El which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt. Had it not been for these specifications the people, not quite free from the taint of polytheism, might not have been certain as to which El it was who was revealing himself, while at the same time these qualifying phrases served to inject into their minds the idea of his abiding personal identity and also of his faithfulness.

God appeared unto Abraham and said, "I am El Shaddai," Almighty El (Gen. xvii, 1), Jacob said unto Joseph, "El Shaddai appeared unto me," (Gen. xlvi, 3). "And El Shaddai give you mercy before the man," (Gen. xlvi, 14). These are the only instances in the book of Genesis in which this title is applied to the Divine Being; but it is used here as one well understood. We are informed indeed later on that he

appeared unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as El Shaddai, indicating that that term was in common use in their day. It so continued as is shown by its very frequent occurrence in all subsequent Hebrew literature. But to what conception of the Divine Being does it point? It characterizes Him not merely as the Being who has might, but also as the One "revealing himself in his might" (Oehler). "It is no longer the powerful Divinity ruling the world in general that is El Shaddai, but the God who testifies of himself in *special deeds of power.*" And these special deeds not being limited to the realm of material nature, but also being wrought in the sphere of the moral. El Shaddai was God regarded as the Being who not only could rule nature, but who (to use the words of Delitzsch) "compels nature to do what is contrary to itself; subdues it to bow and minister to grace."

In the name "El Elyon," of Gen. xiv, 22, and subsequently, is also preserved the conception of God as the absolutely pre-eminent, and the connection in which this title appears in the first instance shows that not only was the absolute pre-eminence of God recognized by Abraham and Melchizedec, but that he was publicly worshiped as such by means of ordinances conducted by a stated functionary; and this, in turn, implies that there must have been at least still a remnant of people left among whom a considerable knowledge of the true God was still preserved—which facts were doubtless known by some of the Israelites of the time of Moses. The reference made to Melchizedec a thousand years later, in the one hundred and tenth Psalm, and still a thousand years later, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, authorizes us to believe that

the priesthood of Melchizedec implied an acknowledgement on his part, and hence on the part of those for whom he officiated, of the doctrine and necessity of an atonement. And that the El Elyon (Most High God) of the passage was not the name of a new heathen deity, and Melchizedec a new neathen priest, is evident from the fact that Christ was called a priest after his order.

Nor is it likely that the term "El Olam" (God Everlasting) of Gen. xxi, 33, is the name of a merely local god, applied to the God whom Abraham worshiped. It is not to be so regarded in the numerous subsequent instances in which the word occurs. The word "Olam," however, does not necessarily mean "everlasting," in our usual sense of that word. As applied to a person, it is one, the beginning or end of whose duration is uncertain or indefinite. The expression "El Olam," according to the Samaritan, Syriac and Arabic versions of the passage, may also mean "God of the universe." But the meaning, "God of eternity," suggested by the Common and Revised English versions, as well as the Septuagint, Vulgate and several Targums, doubtless furnishes the right sense, eternity being pre-eminently that the beginning and end of which are now hidden. We cannot know with certainty, however, the degree of emphasis which the patriarch placed upon the term as descriptive of the Divine Being. The attributes of justice and mercy were also recognized in the patriarchal and Mosaic times as belonging to him, though they were not the ones which gave him name.

Eloah, also translated "God," does not occur in the Pentateuch. It is allied in meaning to the name "El,"

and probably designates God as the Being whose power is such as to inspire terror. Elohim is the most common designation of the Divine Being, not only in Genesis, but in the whole Old Testament, and is also translated "God," though it means the Mighty or Powerful One. It is the plural of Eloah. It is not found in any of the Semitic languages, except the Hebrew, though the term is often used in the Bible to designate the so-called gods of the heathen, as well as the true God.*

That the word "Elohim," when applied to the true God, was used as a plural of excellence, as some suppose, can never be demonstrated; nor can it ever be proved that it hints even remotely at the Trinity. Both of these hypotheses are improbable conjectures. While the word is familiar to the Hebrew language, it is also true that it existed outside the sphere of revelation, as well as within that sphere. The date of the origin of the term is, of course, unknown, but it is not

*The name by which the Deity is known throughout the patriarchal or introductory age of the Jewish church is "Elohim," translated in the English version "God." In this name has been discovered a trace of the conciliatory, comprehensive mission of the first prophet of the true religion. Elohim is a plural noun, though followed by a verb in the singular. When Eloah (God) was first used in the plural, it could only have signified, like any other plural, many Eloahs; and such a plural could only have been formed after the various names of God had become the names of independent deities; that is, during a polytheistic stage. The transition from this into the monotheistic stage could be effected only in two ways either by denying altogether the existence of the Elohim, and changing them into devils—as was done in Persia—or by taking a higher view, looking upon them as so many names, invented with the honest purpose of expressing the various aspects of the Deity, though in time diverted from their original intention. This was the

probable that it was coined to meet the demands of revelation. Within the sphere of Semitic heathenism, it was probably used as an ordinary plural, just as it was used in the sphere of revelation, when applied to the gods of the heathen. Semitic heathenism was polytheistic, and had use for just such a term, to express what was regarded as the prominent Divine element inhering in more than one God.

When the word was brought within the sphere of the religion of Israel its plural form was brought with it, and in this form it was applied to the one true God; but it could scarcely have been applied to him as a suggestion either of majesty or trinity. So remote and metaphysical a hint of the transcendent excellence, or triune personality of God, would have been of little practical value to any one, except perhaps to those already informed of such things by supernatural revelation. When the word became the vehicle of revelation, it was used in the plural form to designate the one true God, because

view taken by Abraham. Whatever were the names of the Elohim worshiped by the numerous clans of his race, Abraham saw that all the Elohim were meant for God, and thus Elohim, comprehending by one name everything that ever was or ever could be called Divine, became the name by which the monotheistic age was rightly inaugurated: a plural conceived and construed as a singular. From this point of view the Semitic name of the Deity, which at first sounds not only ungrammatical, but irrational, becomes clear and intelligible. It is at once the proof that Monotheism rose on the ruins of a polytheistic faith, and that it absorbed and acknowledged the better tendencies of that faith. In the true spirit of the later apostle to the Gentiles, Abraham, his first predecessor and model, declared the God whom they ignorantly worshiped to be the God that made the world and all things therein—the Lord of heaven and earth, in whom we live and move and have our being. (Acts xvii, 23-28) —*Stanley's Jewish Church.*

there was no better generally understood name by which to call him. While Elohim may be regarded as the grammatical plural of Eloah, it really has no singular in fact. El, or Eloah, denotes not one god, but rather one among many gods in so far as it designates an individual at all. The doctrine that there is only one God was lost and found again. In the early Mosaic time it was in process of being found. The new revelation had to coin new words or adopt old ones, as best it might, just as Christianity had to do in the case of the Greek language.

In order that the recipients of the new revelations might eventually no longer doubt that there is only one God, expedients had to be resorted to. The use of no one term, whether of the singular or plural form, would settle the question. One of these expedients, we may suppose, was a syntactical one—the use of the singular verb, or of the definite article, with the plural name Elohim; perhaps another was the invention, or at any rate the adoption, of a new, memorial name, by which the true God should afterwards be distinguished; perhaps another was a course of experimental tests—Jehovah permitting himself, so to speak, to be brought into collision with the so-called gods of the heathen in order that the Hebrews might have sensible proof of his superiority, and finally of the nothingness of the other gods. It was necessary that they should become thoroughly monotheistic, for only thus could they be led to the true distinction between trinitarianism and tritheism. The Biblical revelation always insists on a rigid monotheism; and the very fact that it does this so strenuously even in its earliest stages seems to imply that monotheism was not the prevail-

ing belief at that time. Doubtless such pre-mosaic saints as Noah and Abraham were already monotheists; but that they used a singular or plural noun to designate their conception of the one God can be only a matter of conjecture. The term Elohim in this case may be only the best Hebrew translation of the now unknown term used by them. However this may be, it is a noticeable fact that in the Divine appearances to Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and subsequently, Jehovah was accustomed to introduce himself as the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and Jacob, the God which brought thee up out of Egypt, etc., thus testifying, not only to his faithfulness, but also to his identity, and enabling those addressed to distinguish him from a supposed god of the adjacent nations in whose existence they might believe. The term Elohim, then, was a simple, ordinary plural, and not a metaphysical one. When, however, the Hebrew language came to be used as the vehicle of revelation a new meaning was gradually injected into this word, as was also the case in regard to many others. But if a polytheistic Egyptian, or Canaanite, familiar with the Hebrew language, but not with the Hebrew theology, had heard the word used (e. g. as in Gen. 1, 1) he would doubtless have understood it in a polytheistic sense. For this, among the other reasons, it was necessary that the covenant people should have a distinctive name for the Divine Being, which was furnished in the word Jehovah, and which will be further considered in a subsequent section.

2. The Egyptians possessed no developed cosmogony, or theory concerning the origin of the world and of man. But that the Israelites of the early Mosaic

period, at least the more faithful and enlightened among them, recognized the Elohim of Abraham as the Creator of both is evident from the time of their early history. As yet, however, the first chapters of Genesis had not been written, not in their present form at least, and we can only infer that they reflected the view concerning the origin of things of the patriarchs and Israelites of the early Mosaic period. But the inference is based on the fact that Abraham was the "Friend of God" and the "Father of the Faithful." It is not probable that he who by reason of his intimacy with God had been the recipient of the sublime doctrine of monotheism, and even of a vision of 'Christ's day,' would be left in error concerning the origin of the world and himself. The same is also true in regard to the revelation of dependence, accountability, etc., which man sustains to God.

At the time of the exodus, however, the Israelites were evidently retrograding in respect to the purity of doctrinal beliefs; and it was necessary that their views on these matters should be reshaped by an inspired teacher, here at the very threshold of their national history. It requires a definite knowledge of some things, and strong convictions; to make a great nation, no less than it does to make a great man. Nothing else can give it the force necessary to carry it over the obstacles that will inevitably lie in its way. Had it not been for some things that lay behind it, the Israelites of the exodus could not have achieved the supposed future which lay before it. Moses could have led no band of Egyptians into the wilderness and transformed them, even in forty years, into the chosen people. These considerations suggest the early date

of Gen. i., and indeed of the whole book of Genesis. It is not at all probable that the Israelites would have passed through the greater part, or even a considerable part, of their national history, before putting into orderly shape their divinely-authenticated views and traditions on subjects so important, in relation to themselves, as those which make up the book of Genesis. And to be convinced of the supernatural character of the contents of Genesis one scarcely needs more than compare it with the extra-biblical theology and history, specimens of which have been given in the preceding pages.

CHAPTER II.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF GOD.

§1. *The Name “Jehovah.”*

1. The word “Jehovah,” in the Mosoretic text of the Hebrew Bible, as is well known, generally has the vowel pointing of the word *Adonay, lord.* On account of their excessive reverence for the former name, based upon a misinterpretation of Lev. xxiv, 16, the later Jews would not even pronounce it, but substituted in its place the latter name. They were followed in this by the translators of the King James’ Bible, and later by the Canterbury revisers, and hence the word “LORD” in our English Old Testament is always to be distinguished from “Lord,” and is to be understood as representing *Jehovah* in the original. The primitive and correct mode of pronouncing the word has been entirely, and probably forever, lost; Javeh, or Yaweh, is becoming the generally received mode of

pronunciation among scholars; but the form *Jehovah* will doubtless always maintain its hold on the popular English mind and heart, and little practical or other benefit is derived from any attempt to change it. It is derived from the imperfect tense of the verb *hawah*, the other form of *hayah*, signifying *to be*, the verb and tense occurring in the well-known passage, Ex. iii, 14: "And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM, and he said, thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you." The name signifies, *He who is what He is.* It designates God as eternal and immutable, and who, therefore, will never be other than the same, both as to his essence, and also his moral attributes. This name certainly carries with it the idea of the invariable *faithfulness* of God, and suggests his absolute *independence*, in as much as he who is eternally and immutably what he is cannot be affected or conditioned by that which is exterior to himself.

2. Did the name Jenovah originate with the covenant people, or was it, like the name Elohim, incorporated into the language from the adjacent heathenism? Each opinion has its advocates—though the former view is to be regarded as the true one. Was it known to the patriarchs, or was it revealed, for the first time, to Moses? The fact that this name occurs almost innumerable times in the book of Genesis does not of itself prove anything as to the date of the origin of the name. It only shows, for the most part, that the author of the passages in Genesis where the name occurs was acquainted with it. Nor can the fact that it appears to be used by Eve (Gen. iv. 1), Lamech (v. 29), Abraham (xxii, 14), Eliezer (xxiv, 35), and others, be re-

garded as proving anything more; the word Jehovah in such passages as these being, however, the translation or equivalent of the one actually used by their respective speakers. The passage, Ez. vi. 3, appears to settle the question: "And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob, by the name of El Shadday (God Almighty), but by my name, Jehovah, was I not known to them." But this is not to be construed as teaching that the word *Jehorah* was an abrupt invention, here appearing in the Hebrew language for the first time. The word had doubtless long existed in the language in one form or another, but here it is made to designate an aspect of the Divine Being not hitherto fully disclosed, and which the word only could fully express. Hence, virtually, the Divine Being had not been previously known by this name. This seems to be the plain teaching of the text; nor is it to be regarded as strange or remarkable, for even in this new dispensation of the church men not infrequently pass through experiences which exhibit God to them in an entirely new light, and cause them to apply names to him which had hitherto been devoid of any significance to them. And, indeed, at the best, he is only partially known even to the most advanced New Testament saint.

3. The theological import of the word Jehovah, as compared with El, or Elohim: It has been suggested that "the great epochs of the history of the chosen people are marked by the several names by which, in each, the Divine nature is indicated," and the suggestion is justified, to some extent, by what appears to be the fact in the case. In the patriarchal age, the oldest Hebrew form by which the most general idea of Divin-

ity is expressed is El. Elohim, the Mighty One, the Mighty Ones, or simply The Mighty, which title continued to appear in such old proper names as Beth-el, the house of El; Peni-El, the face of El, "as memorials of this primitive mode of address and worship." It is not probable that El, or Elohim, was at first the name of a personal Deity, but was rather a term designating divinity in general, or the abstract idea of divinity, like Theos in Greek, or Deus in Latin, this divinity individualized being designated by another word, as Baal, Bel, Chemosh, Moloch, etc., corresponding to Jove, Zeus, Jupiter, etc., among the Greeks and Romans. In process of time, however, like other appellations, it became a proper noun, designating not merely a quality or attribute, but a personal God. This circumstance may help to account for the fact that El, or Elohim, like Theos in Greek, is used both with and without the definite article, even when applied to the true God. But the Divine Being was conceived of, outside of the sphere of revelation, not as *ruling in* history, but rather as *ruling over* history, as Creator, Preserver and Judge, and to this aspect of the Divine action, the name Elohim corresponded. He was the God whose position was outside of human history. He was the God of the world at large, whom the heathen also might recognize, though they stood in no covenant relation to him. The name Elohim, to the Israelite, implied that the Divine actions of creating, preserving and judging are *capable of being developed*, or, "that they can reach the appointed end, but not that they will also actually reach it."^{**}

But the introduction of the name Jehovah was the

*Kurtz' *Sacred History*.

beginning of a new era in Hebrew theology, the name Jehovah Sabaoth being introduced at a still later period, and characterizing the era of prophetism. Jehovah is the Divine Being, ruling not merely over history, but also in history. He is the One who not merely can, but actually will develop his purpose in creating, preserving and governing, and carry it on to its appointed end. He is Elohim individualized, and comes into personal covenant relation with man. God appeared unto Moses in the flaming bush, and calls himself the El of Abraham, the El of thy fathers, etc., thus enabling Moses to identify him, and distinguish him from Divinity as conceived of and worshiped by other nations. The old conception of the Divine Being having thus been linked with the new, Jehovah became henceforth a memorial name to all generations of Hebrews; and, under the form of Jehovah Elohim, it was a perpetual reminder, both of his personal identity, and of his covenant; the name of him who both essentially and morally is always what he is, distinguished from whomsoever else might be called El, and to attribute change to whom, or deny his faithfulness to his promise is to deny his being. Whenever the Old Testament saints addressed Elohim as Jehovah, they addressed him as one whom they understood to be their God in a peculiar covenant sense, just as they understood themselves to be his people in a sense in which the other nations were not. An analogous distinction appears in New Testament theology, in as much as the Divine Being is all men's God, while he is the Father of only the adopted, the actual Saviour of only the believer.

The books of the Old Testament were written after the revelation of the New Name to Moses, after the

term Elohim and Jehovah were thoroughly associated in the minds, at least, of the more enlightened of the people; hence the interchangeableness of the two names, and the apparent indifference with which the writers of these books use the one name or the other. But the name Jehovah never lost its special and precious significance; not at least until the later ages, when Old Testament theology begins to fade away into the theology of scribes and rabbis, and the name begins to be enveloped in superstition, until finally it disappears from the spoken language.*

§2. *God as the Only One.*

The Mosaic doctrine of God is unequivocally monotheistic. But that the Israelites themselves were, at this period of their history, pronounced monotheists, cannot be affirmed. Their doctrine of the Divine Be-

*Already, at the time of the Samaritan secession, in the days of Nehemiah, the change began to operate. In their usages, instead of the word Jehovah, was substituted Shemeh—the Name; but they still had retained the word unaltered in their own copies of the law. But the Jews of Jerusalem, in the place of the ancient name, substituted, first by pronunciation, and then by changing the points of the vowels, throughout the sacred writings, the word Adonay, Lord or Master—the same word that appears for the Phœnician deity, whom the Syrian maidens mourned on Lebanon; by the time that the Greek translators of the Hebrew Scriptures undertook their task, they found that this conventional phrase had become completely established, and therefore, wherever the word *Jehovah* occurs in the Hebrew, misrendered it *Kurios*, Master (or Lord); and the Latin translators, following the Greek, misrendered it again, with their eyes open, Dominus; and the Protestant versions (including the Canterbury, or Revised English,) with a few rare exceptions, misrendered it yet again, "Lord," and thus it came to pass that the most expressive title of the Eternal and Self-Existent, which, in the time of Moses and Samuel, of Elijah and Isiah, it would have

ing was not such as to exclude the very possibility of other Gods, nor even the actuality of them.

They may have believed in the essential oneness of Divinity, just as the element of human nature in a human individual is one and the same. But the doctrine of Divine unity is not the counterpart of the doctrine of human unity, or of the unity of the human race. The doctrine of the Divine unity is the doctrine of the absolute Divine oneness. If the possession on the part of any being of a divine element, or an element held in common with God, constituted that being a god, then, indeed, it may be said there are gods many, and it might become a question, as it actually did, which of these is the supreme one.

That polytheism, in one form or another, was the besetting sin of the Israelites, is evident from the

been deemed a sin to keep silent, it became in these later ages a sin to pronounce. On the misconstruction, which had been thus dictated by superfluous reverence, were engrafted all manner of fancies and exaggerations. The most extravagant superstitions were attached to this rejection of the sacred phrase, as confidently as in earlier times they would have been attached to its assertion. The Greek translators even went the length of altering or retaining the alteration of a text in Leviticus, which condemns to death any one who blasphemed the name of Jehovah, into the condemnation of any one who pronounces it. The name itself lingered only in the mouth of the High Priest, who uttered it only on the ten occasions which required it, on the day of atonement; and after the time of Simon the Just, even this was in a whisper. If any one else gained possession of it, it was a talisman, by which, if he was bold enough to utter its mysterious sound, miracles could be worked, and magical arts exercised. "The Ineffable Name," the Tetramaton, became a charm, analogous to those secret, sacred names on which the heathen writers had already prided themselves.—Stanly's *Jewish Church*, Sec. xlvi.

whole course of their history, and from the nature of the discipline imposed upon them, from the time of the exodus unto the time of the Babylonian exile. And the object of God in furnishing the new name, Jehovah, as the symbol of the new aspect of his character and being which he had revealed to them, was, that it might serve them, not only as a perpetual reminder of the covenant relation in which he had stood to them since the time of Abraham, but also a means whereby they might be drilled into the knowledge of his eternal and exclusive oneness. It was easier to indoctrinate them by means of a new, untarnished name, and yet full of meaning peculiar to itself, than it was to teach them by means of an old name, already stained with the impure conceptions of heathenism. The Egyptians had called the Divine Being (or *a* divine being) Osiris; but manifestly no such name of Elohim as this would do, and hence the name Jehovah becomes the core in which the Mosaic teachings concerning God are made to inhere. In becoming accustomed to call him by a new name, they would also become accustomed to eliminate from their conceptions of him the old heathenish attributes, and attach to him the true ones.

Thus was the lost ground, occupied by Abraham, in regard to the Divine unity, regained. Hear, O Israel: The *Lora* our God is one *Lord*. Or, in the terser form of the original, Hear, O Israel, Jehovah, our Elohim, Jehovah one (Deut. vi, 4), was destined to become the Creed of the Jews. But it was not at this period. It asserts that Jehovah, and he alone, is the absolute, uncaused God, the very one who by reason of his choice of them as his people, had made himself known to them. But the assertion of this absolute

and exclusive oneness of Jehovah God had to be repeated in one form and another over and over again. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" (Ex. xx, 3; Deut. v, 7) was only another way of saying, "I, Jehovah, am the only God, and thou shalt so recognize me." It was fundamentally necessary to their indoctrination in other matters that they should; and the earnestness and repetition with which this is insisted upon testifies, not only to its importance, but also to the fact that it was a truth which the Israelites had not as yet thoroughly grasped. "Unto thee," says Moses to them, "unto thee it was showed, that thou mightest know that Jehovah he is God; there is none else besides him" . . . "know therefore this day; and consider it in thine heart, that Jehovah he is God in heaven above, and upon earth beneath; there is none else." (Deut. iv, 35, 39).

But the doctrine that Jehovah was God, and the only one, was taught otherwise than in assertions hinged upon the name, or in inferences deduced from the knowledge which the people may have had of its meaning. It was taught also in object lessons in the form of miracles, victories, defeats, and other events. When the escape from Egypt was so strangely and marvelously effected, it was emphasized that it was Jehovah who did it, and that he did it in opposition to the god of Pharaoh. Ex. xiii, 21, 22; xiv, 13, 14, 31; xv, 6, 7. The proof of the superiority of Jehovah would ultimately become proof that the god of Egypt was no God. When water was needed for the famishing host, the fact was emphasized that he who caused it to issue in abundance from the dry rocks of the desert was Jehovah. Ex. xvii, 1-7. When the

people hungered for bread and meat it was emphasized that he who furnished it in a way in which no other being could was Jehovah (Ex. xvi, 4-35). When the battle was raging against the Amalekites it was impressed upon the people that he who gave the victory was Jehovah (Ex. xvii, 8-16). The proof that Jehovah God was mightier than the gods of Amalek, Moab, and the rest, would ultimately become proof that the latter were no gods. The same lesson in regard to the absolute and exclusive Divinity of Jehovah was taught negatively in the defeats of the Israelites, in as much as these were a lively exhibition to them of the direful results of want of faith in Jehovah as the Only One. Sinai was a brilliant and thundering proclamation of the same fundamental doctrine, the people being made to know that the lightning, and thunder and quaking were caused by the presence of Jehovah in the mount. The Tabernacle, also, with its ritual, was designed, in part, to fix their minds upon the fact, and to accustom them more and more to the fact of the absolute oneness of Jehovah as contradistinguished from all other gods, and that he alone should be the object of their worship and faith. "I, Jehovah thy Elohim am a jealous Elohim" (Ex. xx, 5), tolerating the worship of no being but himself, and zealous in the defense of his honor as the only one in whom they should have any faith or repose any trust—the eternal, absolute, Only God, "visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation" of those denying this truth, "and showing mercy unto thousands [or unto the thousandth generation] of them that love and keep my commandments."

§3 God as Invisible and Spiritual.

The doctrine of the spirituality of God was perhaps not peculiar to Mosaism; but Mosaism eliminated from the doctrine its impure heathenish accretions and emphasized it by means of both word and symbol. It is no where, however, expressly stated in the Pentateuchal books that God is Spirit, or that God is *a* Spirit; and the reason for this is that the mere *fact* was not doubted.* It only needed to be exhibited in its proper light and enforced. Jehovah proceeded to do this by means of both a negative and a positive method.

In the first place it is worthy of notice that Jehovah ceases, for the most part, to appear unto his people in human form (as he had appeared at least in former times), to say nothing of the bestial impersonation of Elohim common among the heathen. In order that he may elevate their conception of him; in order that he may draw them nigh unto him, he withdraws himself from them. He appears unto them in the pillar of cloud, or of fire, or as a formless presence, or as only a voice. Jehovah spoke unto them out of the midst of the fire: they heard the voice of his words, but saw no similitude: only a voice (Deut. iv, 12). “There shall no man see me and live” (Ex. xxxiii, 20) was a suggestion of his spirituality as well as a proclamation

*The saying of Christ to the woman of Samaria, “God is a Spirit [or God is Spirit], and they that worship him,” etc. (John iv, 24), was not intended by him as a new revelation to her of a hitherto unknown doctrine of the spirituality of God. On the contrary, the doctrine was well known, not only to the Samaritans, but through the Old Testament times; and Christ simply meant that in as much as God is Spirit he ought to be worshiped, etc.

of his transcendent glory. Only unto Moses was vouchsafed special vision and revelation of Jehovah, and even to him as “through a glass darkly” (Ex. xxxiii, 22, 23).

In the second place, the prohibition by Jehovah of all forms of image worship was both a positive proof of his spirituality and a step in the process of purifying the Israelitish conception of him, “Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image,* or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the waters under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I, Jehovah, thy God, am a jealous God,” etc. (Ex. xx, 4, 5). The denial of the existence of Elohim was not dreamed of among the Israelites, nor was it likely that they would ever wholly repudiate the name Jehovah, by which they had begun to call him. But, as an illustration of the gross and material nature of their conception of him, and of the influence upon them of Egyptian heathenism, it is sufficient to recall the fact that, even while Moses was on the mount, receiving from Jehovah instructions concerning the organization and government of the people, they were in the valley below, making and worshiping the golden calf—as a symbol, most probably, of Divinity, though, perhaps, not of Jehovah. The words of Aaron (Ex. xxxii, 5) indicate that he meant it as the visible representation of the invisible Jehovah, the ox being the symbol of strength with which he was familiar in Egypt. But it is not likely the people had any well-defined view as to whom the calf represented. The exceeding severity of the punishment inflicted upon the people for this idola-

trous defection is sufficiently justified on the ground of the exceeding importance of the doctrine of the Divine spirituality, to say nothing of other attributes which were also involved. The destiny of the Israelites, of the human race indeed, depended upon the inculcation and preservation among men of the knowledge of the true God, to which end the knowledge, also, of his spirituality was fundamental.

But how shall we account for the anthropomorphisms with which Mosaism abounds? Simply by affirming that the Israelites understood them according to their obvious import—that is, that they were mere figures of speech.

§4. *God as the Holy One.*

It was also necessary that the Israelites should be instructed, at the very outset of their ministry as a nation, in regard to the holiness of Jehovah God. But in order to this end, the idea of holiness had, in large part, to be coined anew. The word, or mold, employed for this purpose had, perhaps, existed in their language from its beginning, but a new meaning had to be infused into it.

The word translated “holy” occurs for the first time in Ex. iii, 5: “Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.” Moses attached no moral quality to the ground, of course, but he understood aright that it was no common ground, and was not to be stood upon as such. The invisible presence of One whose Voice he had heard issuing from the flame would cause him instinctively to separate it in his mind from the adjacent ground. The Voice commanding him to put off his shoes awakened

the instinct, but so far as we may argue from this isolated instance, we cannot infer that Moses either did or did not attach to the Speaker all that we understand by the moral quality of holiness. The Speaker meant, doubtless, more than the hearer at first understood, as is generally the case when a teacher begins to teach. The object of the Speaker was to awaken an idea which may have lain in the mind of the pupil in the form of a dormant instinct, and he begins in the only practical way, that is, by using a figure of speech: ‘Take the shoes from off thy feet, for the ground whereon thou standest is not to be regarded as common ground, because of my presence here.’ The idea of apartness, separation, difference between it and the common, could soon be transferred in the mind of the pupil from the ground to the Speaker who occupied it. Had Jehovah said outright: ‘Take thy shoes off thy feet, for I, who am present here, am holy,’ using the word holy in our fully developed sense of the term, Moses might not have caught the lesson intended to be conveyed; and yet it is true that he had an extraordinary natural basis for Divine instruction which rendered him the most available and readiest recipient of revelations wholly supernatural. But whether Moses himself had, or did not have, from the beginning of his course the fully developed idea of the holiness of Jehovah, it is certain that the people of Israel did not have it. And it is also certain that one of the great truths which Jehovah was constantly seeking to instill into their minds, through the instrumentality of Moses, was the truth that Jehovah is holy, and hence they should be so. ‘I am Jehovah that bringeth you up out of the land of Egypt, to be your God; ye shall

therefore be holy, for I am holy" (Lev. xi, 45). Speak unto all the congregation of the children of Israel, and say unto them, Ye shall be holy; for I Jehovah your God am holy (Lev. xix, 2).

But what idea did the Israelites attach to the word "holy" as applied to Jehovah? The answer can be inferred from the idea which they attached to it, when applied to themselves; and this in turn may be inferred from the law distinguishing all animals into two classes of clean and unclean, to say nothing of other laws illustrating the same truth. The object of this law is expressly stated in Lev. xx, 24-26. "I am Jehovah your God which have separated you from other people, ye shall therefore put a difference between clean beasts and unclean. . . . And ye shall be holy unto me; for I Jehovah am holy, and have saved you from other people, that ye should be mine." As this distinction would perpetually remind them of the difference between themselves and other nations, so would it necessarily remind them of the difference between Jehovah and the gods of the heathen—their own *apartness* in respect to other peoples always being expressly associated with the apartness of Jehovah from other gods, and from all creation. But apartness, or difference, in respect to what? The answer is in respect principally to cleanliness, or purity. The purity of places and animal bodies, however, did not consist in their separation from others, but was rather based upon it. Originally the thing was called pure, or holy, because it had been separated from the common: and afterwards by transferring the thought from the domain of the material to that of the moral and spiritual the idea could be grasped that the

separation consisted in difference of purity. Thus Jehovah became the Holy One in the sense of the Pure One. He was so pre-eminently pure that in contrast with him the gods of the nations were not called so at all. He thus became the standard of his own character and conduct. Whatever he was or whatever he did was right. He also thus became the standard of his people. His law was the expression of himself: what ever was out of harmony with his law or fell below the purity of himself was unholy or sinful.

The complex idea of the Divine holiness, therefore, which it was sought to instill into the minds of the Israelites, and which should serve as the standard whereby to regulate themselves was (1) apartness from all so called gods recognizing them in no sense and having nothing in common with them, (2) that quality or disposition in him which causes him to make himself known to and communicate himself to the creature, especially to his people, (3) especially separation from all the moral influences of the so called gods and of all creatures; that element of the Divine nature which excludes all communion with or participation in that which is sinful or wicked.

§5 *Attributes Implied in Holiness.*

It follows from what has been said above, that as the Israelite came to know God as holy in himself they would also at the same time come to know him as holy in all his actions and dealings. He in whose nature no wrong was involved could do no wrong to others. Hence the Holy One would also be the Just One. The fact that Jehovah *is* Jehovah implies that he is *faithful* in the sense of true to his own nature;

but the fact that he is holy implies, not only that he is just, but also that he is faithful in the sense of true to his word. He who is faithless deceives; he who deceives is not holy, and he who deceives is not just. Justice and faithfulness may therefore be called the ethical side of the Divine holiness, and as such are the same as the Divine righteousness and truth. But he who is just in his own character and acts, can not approve of that which is not so in the character and conduct of any of his creatures, whether in their relation to one another or to himself. Hence the Divine jealousy or zeal with which Jehovah would defend his own honor. Hence, again, the Divine law to the people, whether in regard to their relations to one another or to himself would have its origin in the Divine character, and would at the same time serve as a medium through which the Divine character could be seen and known. The Israelites could not at first recognize the law as holy, just, and good, because they recognized the Jehovah as such; but they would first perceive the law to be such and then conclude that so must its author be. The law must therefore, be, to some extent, an appeal to the natural instincts, or intuitions of the people, and at the same time further awaken and educate them. It does not follow from this, however, that the Israelites might themselves have originated the law, for the law as light, awakens the sense of vision, and the sense of vision in turn recognizes the law as light.

But the Israelites were not left to infer these things, nor to depend on the expression of them as involved in the law. They were taught in plain words that Jehovah, their God, was THE Rock, a God who possessed

immutability and impregnable strength as attributes, not only of his being, but also of his nature; a God whose "work is perfect," all his ways being judgment, a God of truth, or faithfulness to his word, without iniquity or unfairness, just and right (Deut. xxxii, 4). "Ye shall not go after other gods, of the gods of the people which are round about you; (for Jehovah, thy God is a jealous God among you) lest the anger of Jehovah, thy God, be kindled against thee, and destroy thee from off the face of the earth." (Deut. vi, 14.) Again, "Of the Rock that begot thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that formed thee." "They have moved me to jealousy with that which is not God; they have provoked me to anger with their vanities." (Deut. xxxii, 8, 21); from which it appears that it is idolatry which most provokes the Divine jealousy, because it argues faithlessness to Jehovah on the part of the people whom he had chosen, and who had been the object of his special care. Jehovah's wrath is presented as the manifestation of his jealousy or zeal in the defense of his wounded honor as the only God, and also as the manifestation of his love, wounded by the faithlessness and ingratitude of those whom he had chosen, and upon whom he had lavished his love so liberally.

But justice is both legislative and judicial. In the one case it imposes rules of conduct; in the other, it inflicts punishments and bestows rewards.

The actual experience of the Israelites of this legislative and judicial justice of Jehovah, as well as the actual oral teachings communicated through Moses, was a long course of tuition in which they also had opportunity to learn of him also as the God of Love, as evinced in his manifest goodness to them as a people;

in his forgiveness of them when they sinned; in his mercy toward them when they suffered; and in his long-suffering toward them when they resisted him, as they often did. (Ex. xxxiv, 6, 7). "Oh that there were such a heart in them that they would fear me, and keep all my commandments always, that it might be well with them and their children for ever." (Deut. v. 29.)

The omnipresence of Jehovah God is not taught in Mosaism, though it is plainly presupposed or implied, and is expressly affirmed in the immediately subsequent period, in such passages as I Kgs. viii, 27; Ps. cxxxix, 7, 8; Jer. xxiii, 23. Jehovah may have been regarded at first by many of the Hebrews as a merely local and tutelary God, one among the many; but this was not the doctrine taught. The teaching concerning him as the Only One would mure them to the conception of his omnipresence.

§6. *God as Creator and Sovereign.*

That the Israelites were taught at this early period of their history to look upon Jehovah as the Creator and absolute Sovereign of all things and creatures is implied in what has been said in the preceding section. The following passages, however, are directly to the point: "For in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is." (Ex. xx. ii.) "Behold, the heaven and the heaven of heavens is Jehovah's, thy God, the earth, also, with all that th rein is." (Deut. x, 14.) See also Num. xvi, 22; xxvii, 16, etc.

1. *God as Creator.* The passages above quoted undoubtedly belong to the period of Mosaism. The first

chapter of Genesis is only an expansion of what is here presented in a nutshell. We may assume that the essential theory of creation embodied in this chapter belongs also to the Mosaic period. The declarations in subsequent periods of Old Testament theology on the subject of the Divine relation to the world are always presented, as well known and recognized truths, and not in the aspect of new revelations; so that such statements as Psa. lxxxix, 11; cxv, 16, etc., may be regarded also as the doctrine of Mosaism. The Mosaic doctrine of creation places itself far above all heathen and non-biblical theories, by the sublime declaration: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth;" though it is obvious that the first chapter of Genesis and the subsequent inspired commentaries upon it are, so far as their *form* is concerned, addressed to the religious faith of the people, rather than to their scientific curiosity. It stands in direct contradiction to the atheistic theory of chance. The world was not produced by any process of self-generation, nor by the unintelligent action of impersonal forces, nor by many agents like the good and evil principles of the Persian theory, with which the Israelites may have become acquainted during the Babylonian captivity. It denies all forms of Pantheism, for it presents the creation as distinct from the world, and as exalted above the world. It implies, and it implied it to the Israelitish mind, the eternity of the God whose existence it assumes, for, having created all things, he must be before all things; it implied his omnipotence, for he who created the heavens and the earth could do anything that was conceivable; it implied his absolute freedom, for it represented him not only as beginning a new

course of action, but as doing it by the free exercise of his own will; it also implied to them his infinite wisdom, for such an orderly heaven and earth as was known even to the Israelites could be the product only of a mind of absolute intelligence. It represented Elohim whom the Israelites had been taught to recognize as identical with Jehovah, as creating, by means of his *word* and *spirit*. "God said," and it was done; his spirit moved or brooded, as if incubating or animating and calling forth life in the new, inanimate, unarranged creation. But the knowledge of the triune personality of God, and the relation of the three Persons, respectively, to the creation, does not seem to have been distinctly revealed to the Israelites of this period. His Spirit, though presented as animating (Gen. i, 2; ii, 7); as striving with man (vi, 3), and as enlightening (Ex. xxxi, 3), is nowhere clearly distinguished as a distinct personality from himself.

2. God as Governor and Preserver of all Things. Mosaism, as well as all subsequent facts of the Old Testament, taught in the strongest terms the doctrine of the Divine Sovereignty; not because of the slowness of the Israelites to accept it, but because of its fundamental importance. It is implied in the Genesis account of creation. In creating, God also prescribed the law of the being, or life, of that which he created, as is suggested in the often-recurring phrases, "and it was so," and "according to its kind." It is implied in the command to multiply and exercise the dominion delegated to him. It is implied in the destruction of the race, save the family of Noah; and in other known conspicuous events, the most recent of which are the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt and the over-

throw of Pharaoh. Aside from the importance of the doctrine itself, the chief point in the tuition of the Israelites was to identify the Elohim who did these things with Jehovah, the God of the Hebrews. It was another way of proving to them the absolute and exclusive oneness of Jehovah. The creation account, as contained in Gen. ii, would in this respect, be of more theological significance to them than Gen. i; so would the Jehovahistic account of the deluge, as compared with those sections in which the name Elohim is used. (Compare e. g. ch. vi, 5, with xi, 12; vi, 7, with vi, 13; vii, 5, with vi, 22, etc.

Such passages, also as Psa. xciii, 1; xvi, 10; civ, cxlvii, 15-18, though they belong to a later period, represent the Mosaic doctrine of the Divine relation to the world as Governor and Preserver (compare Ex. xv, 1-19). Little emphasis was placed upon secondary causes and natural laws, only in so far as these were expressly declared either to have their origin in him or to be subject to him. All things, material and immaterial, rational and irrational, owed not only their existence, but the continuation and regulation of their existence to Jehovah God. The Mosaic doctrine of Providence asserted not only the overruling, but the immediate and special in-ruling of God, in the sphere both of the physical world and of human history. Gen. xlv, 7, 8, expresses not merely the view of Joseph, but of Mosaism generally, and of the whole Old Testament. It was Jehovah who ordered the events which resulted in the hardening of Pharaoh's heart) Ex. iv, 21). "Who speaketh and it cometh to pass, without God having commanded it?" . . . "Out of the mouth of the Most High should not evil come, as well as good!"

(Lam. iii, 37, 39.) "Who forms light and creates darkness, who makes peace and produces evil." . . .

"Why doth a man murmur at his life?" seeing that it is Jehovah who doeth all this. (Isa. xlv, 71.)

The same doctrine appears also in the Gospels in the often recurring formula, "Thus it was done in order that it might be fulfilled," etc., in which the "in order that" is to be construed in its proper tetic sense. But that none of these sayings were to be understood as denying human free agency, and consequently, human accountability, is evident from the whole drift of the teaching. "Why doth a man murmur at his life?" is followed by "Let every one murmur over his sins;" man's history, being a duplex thing, made up a Divine and a human factor.

Physical evil is presented in the Pentateuch as a Divine punishment for sin, or as a Divine "means of proving his obedience and his trust in God," and thereby of strengthening, encouraging and purifying him (Deut. viii; 2f). In its relation to the moral evil the Divine sovereignty manifests itself, not in producing it, but in so overruling it as to make it subservient to the Divine purpose, (Gen. 1, 20), in which sense the act of which moral evil is predicted is described as being God's own act, as in Gen. xlv, 20; Ex. vii, 21, etc. Moral evil is also used as a means of trying and purifying others than those who committed it, as in Deut. xiii, 3, and also of vindicating the Divine justice. But, after all the distinguishing peculiarity of Mosaism, and indeed, of the whole Old Testament, in regard to the sovereignty of God, was the emphasis which it placed upon the Divine side of all that comes to pass, rather than upon the human.

His sovereignty was not divided or shared with another.

3. *The Divine Purpose in the Creation, Government and Preservation of the World.* Questions of teleology are not likely to receive much of an infant nation's attention. Problems more practical in their nature and of more immediate importance pressed upon the Israelites than the questions, why did God create the world? and, what purpose has he in view in governing it and preserving it? The main thing was to see that the national and individual life on earth was well ordered; and for this reason, in part at least, the Pentateuch contains little explicit teaching on the subject of final causes. But though the Israelites may not have formally raised such questions, Mosaism does not leave them wholly untouched. The frequently recurring formula in the account of creation: "And God saw that it was good" implies not merely that it was fair and agreeable as an object of Divine contemplation, but that it was good for something, well adapted to the end which God had in view in its creation. That this end was his own glory is evident from the fact that the creative work does not end until it reaches the culmination in the creation of man in the image of God himself. The material universe, we conceive, would be aimless if there were no man; and man himself would be an unanswerable problem, if there were no God. Sin disturbed the Divine purpose, but shall not thwart it. "As truly as I live," says Jehovah, "the whole earth shall be filled with the glory of Jehovah." (Num. xiv, 21).

§7. *God's Revelation of Himself to Man.*

Man cannot hold intercourse with spirit, as man does with man. God is pure spirit, and infinitely above

man. In the infinite fullness of his being, he is beyond the reach of man. He must, therefore, bring himself down, in some way, within the limit of man's sphere, in order that man may have some degree of knowledge of him. Our inquiry is: what is the teaching of the Pentateuch on this point? The subject resolves itself into three parts: 1st, the Divine self-revelation itself; 2d, its forms; 3d, the condition of the soul during the reception of the revelation.

1. *The Divine Self-Revelation Itself.* It is not the revelation of some truth that is here discussed, but the revelation of the Divine Being himself, and by himself. These revelations are characterized as the Divine Name, the Divine Presence or Face, and the Divine Glory.

a. *The Divine Name.* As God could be known by man only in so far as he revealed himself to man, sometimes the revelation which he made of himself is called the Divine *Name*. It was an index, serving to point the people to certain attributes of his being or nature. The names of himself, therefore, which God gave to his people are to be considered from a different point of view from the names which the people gave to him. The former represented an actual increment in their knowledge of God; the latter merely embodied such conceptions of him as were already had. "And Moses said unto God . . . they shall say unto me, what is his name?" And God said unto Moses, "I AM THAT I AM . . . thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, JEHOVAH . . . hath sent me unto you; this is my name forever." (Ex. iii, 18; see also vi, 3; ix, 16; xv, 3; xx, 24; xxxiv, 14, etc.) The name of God thus became equivalent to God

himself, his whole administration and attributes. To know any particular name of him was to know him, in so far as that name revealed him. To profane his name in any way was to profane himself.

b. *The Divine Presence or Face.* See Ex. xxxiii, 14–15. In Deut. iv, 37, “brought thee out in his sight” is literally “by his face”—that is, “by the might of his personal presence.” This was a manifestation of God distinct from that made in the Divine Name, and also from the Divine essence.

c. *The Divine Glory.* His essential glory neither veiled by a cloud nor represented by an angel; manifested only to Moses, and to him only in part; see Ex. xxxiii, 17–23, in which passage the term “glory” is not to be understood as a synonym of “presence” or “face.”

2. *Forms of the Self-Revelation.* a. *The Divine Voice.* The audible voice of Jehovah is here meant. Deut. iv, 12, is the principal passage. Doubtless the revelations were made on other occasions in the form of a voice. (See also Matt. xvii, 5; Jno. xii, 28). The Voice appears in the later Jewish theology. Bath Khol, not the Voice itself of Jehovah, but only as the Echo, or Daughter of the Voice.

b. *The Malakh.* God also revealed himself as the Angel, generally called the Angel Jehovah, sometimes the Angel of Elohim. The principal passages are Gen. xvi, 7, and following; xviii, 1–33; xxi, 17; xxii, 12, and following; xxiv; xxxii; xlvi; Ex. iii, 2; xiii, 21; xxxii; Josh. v, 14 and following; Judges ii, 1–5; and Mal. iii, 1, where he is called the Angel, or Messenger of the covenant. The problem of this “Angel of the Lord” is recognized by those who have attempted

its solution as one of the most difficult ones in biblical theology, and one "on which there have been various views from the earliest ages of the church, and about which, to this day, no agreement has been reached."—(Oehler). Hodge, Watson, Hengstenberg, and many other able modern exegetes think the Malakh was the Christ of the New Testament. This view was also held by many of the Greek fathers, as Justin Martyr, Ireneas, Tertullian, Cyprian and Eusebius. It is the view I prefer. Oehler, Kurtz, Delitzsch, and others, hold a different opinion.*

The Pentateuch makes only infrequent mention of the other angels, the "sons of God" of Gen. vi, 2, not being an instance in point. But however important the question as to who the Angel of Jehovah was may have been or may still be regarded from the standpoint of Old Testament Christology, it concerns us here to consider this and other angels of the Pentateuch only as revealers of God. The doctrine of "the Angel" is also important in its connection with the angelology of the Old Testament.

e. *The Shekinah.* By this is here meant the abiding

*Sometimes the same Divine appearance which at one time is called Malakh Jehovah is afterward called simply Jehovah, as Gen. xvi. 7f; comp. v. 13; xxii, 11, comp. v. 12; xxxi, 11, comp. v. 16. This is to be so understood that the *Angel of God* is here nothing else than the invisible Deity itself, which thus unveils itself to mortal eyes.—*Gesenius*. But whichever may be the correct view of the Angel of Jehovah, or the Angel Jehovah, it seems evident that the Israelites did not recognize in him the Messiah, whatever may have been the opinion of Malachi, later on, concerning the meaning of his own prophecy. While, however, this angel may in reality have been the Christ, it is not likely that the earlier Old Testament writers meant to teach that he was.

in a peculiar manner of the Divine Presence in one place, as distinguished from occasional manifestations otherwise and elsewhere. The cherubim of the garden of Eden are thought to have been this peculiar presence of God, different from his more ordinary modes of self-manifestation. But the passage most in point here is Deut. xii, 5, a text rightly regarded as referring to the Shekinah in the above sense of the term. The purpose of the command is to centralize, as far as practical, the religious worship of the Israelites, and thereby diminish the liability to idolatry and polytheism. The inner tabernacle (and later the temple) was the peculiar dwelling place of the Divine Presence or Glory, and wherever the tabernacle was, there should be the center of the national worship. But the Shekinah itself does not appear in the Pentateuch nor elsewhere in the Old Testament. It is peculiar to the later uninspired Jewish theology.

d. *Miracles.* God also revealed himself in miracles, the term here being used in the sense of manifestations of power, as (1) in the bringing about of such extraordinary events as are calculated to excite astonishment, and be referred to other than a human source, but without reference to the mode whereby they are accomplished (Ex. xv, 11); or (2) such mighty achievements as neither men nor any of the gods could accomplish, and which are therefore "exempt from the common course of nature and history," (Deut. iii: 24); or (3) such signs and wonders as were regarded as peculiar tokens, or proofs of divine authority (Ex. iv: 21; vii: 3; Deut. xxviii: 46). From none of the Hebrew words, however, used in these cases respectively, could it be inferred that the event described transcends

human power, or in any way contravenes natural laws, these conclusions being based upon the peculiar character and surroundings of the work itself. "Now also the magicians of Egypt, they also did in like manner with their enchantments" (Ex. vii: 11), the difference between what they did and what Jehovah did, through Moses, not being apparent to the casual observer. But in other instances it was immediately obvious that the work done transcended human power, and lay outside the sphere of natural law, and hence was a more striking manifestation of a Divine Power and Person.

e. *The Spirit of God.* Still another form of the Divine self-revelation was the spirit of God in man. In the Old Testament the spirit of God, or, which is the same thing, the spirit of Jehovah, is a divine power, or knowledge, or influence, communicated to man, not an indwelling in him of the personal Holy Spirit. This divine influence was communicated to the prophets and leaders of the covenant people for the purpose of endowing them with the gifts required for their calling. "And I have filled him (Bezleel) with the spirit of God, in wisdom, . . . to devise cunning works," etc. (Ex. xxxi, 3), reference being had here to something more than even human skill. "And I will take of the spirit which is upon thee, and will put it upon them [the elders]; and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee," etc. (Num. xi, 17); that is, the elders should have their portion in the same divine gifts which Moses had. Joshua, also, was endowed by God with the requisite spiritual qualifications for the office which he filled (Num. xxvii, 18). The spirit of God also came upon Balaam, impelling him to prophecy in

opposition to his natural inclinations (Num. xxiv, 2). The spirit, in the sense in which the term is here used, does not appear in the Pentateuch as affecting the work of purification in the heart of man; here the spirit is mainly an enlightening influence, and at the same time a testimony of God in regard to himself; sanctification being an outward formula illustrative of the required inward purity. This inward purity, as the product of the spirit of God, is first spoken of in the Psalms (see Psa. xli, 10-13, exi, 3, 10), and in only two of these. But such references abound in the New Testament.

3. *The condition of the human soul during the reception of divine self-revelation.*

a. The Dream (chalom). The influence of the spirit of God upon the soul extends to its sleeping state as well as to its waking state. Impressions through the various physical faculties being excluded from the soul during sleep, it becomes then only the more susceptible to divine impressions. "The voice of the Lord God" can be more readily heard by man in the silence and solitude of the evening. The divine spirit whispers to the spirit of man, the sensuous and reflective faculties being asleep, producing dreams. God often communicated himself to man in this way, not only to his chosen mediums of revelation, but to Abimilech, Pharaoh, Nebuchadnezzar and others as well. The dreams of revelation were different in their origin from the ordinary dreams produced by physical causes, and were distinguished from the latter by something peculiar connected with them which impresse itself upon the mind of the dreamer as divinely significant. It is possible, however, that the person may sometimes

have been so far mistaken as to the origin of his dream as to attach a significance to it which it did not in reality have (Jer. xxiii, 27, 32; Deut. xiii, 5).

b. *The Vision* (*chazon* and *machazeh*). The words are from the same root, the former form not occurring in the Pentateuch. God made himself known to Abraham once in a vision (Gen. xv, 1) and also to Balaam (Num. xxiv, 4; see also Gen. xlvi, 2; Num. xii, 6). From the paucity of references we may probably infer that God did not usually make himself known in visions in those days. In the vision the subject matter of the revelation was divinely present to the seer, and his reflective faculties seem to have been awake. It was a higher form of revelation than the dream.

c. *The immediate sight of Divinity*, the waking vision or direct revelation of God to man, independent of dreams or sleeping vision. It is thought by some that the vision of Gen. xv, 1, was of this kind, but this is not the most tenable view. This was the highest form of revelation.

CHAPTER III.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF MAN.

Definition.

The Mosaic Anthropology is a systematic presentation of the teachings of the Pentateuch concerning man. It deals with the subject mainly, though not exclusively, in its moral and spiritual aspects. The Genesis account itself suggests the two-fold division under which the contents of this chapter may be treated, viz:

(1) Man as he was originally created; (2) Man as affected by sin. Although we do not know the exact date of the composition of Genesis, we must assume that the information which it furnishes us concerning the origin, nature and destination of man, appertains to the Mosaic anthropology and not to that of a later period; and we must therefore also assume that this information was, in its essential elements, at least, in the possession of the Israelites of the Exodus.

A. MAN AS ORIGINALLY CREATED.

§ 1. *His Origin.*

The Pentateuch knows nothing of any human race, except the Adamic, neither does any subsequent portion of the sacred Scriptures. The doctrine of autoethony as held by the Greeks, and perhaps some other ancient nations, is of extra biblical origin, the Adam of Genesis being the first father, not merely of some, but of all beings to whom may be applied the adjective *human*. It did not occur to the Israelites to believe any other doctrine than this concerning the origin of man. It is this common descent of all men from one father that entitles man to be called a race. In Genesis, two accounts of man's origin are given. The second (ch. ii, 7,) must be referred to first in the order of our treatment. And Jehovah God formed man, or moulded him, as a potter does his clay, of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul. It was not only an El, or one of the Elohim that did it, but it was the only one, the Elohim whom the Israelites had already come to know as Jehovah. He formed man's body of the dust of the ground, transmuting it into live flesh and bones

by breathing into his nostrils the breath of lives (ruach chayyim), thus causing him to become a living soul (nephesh chayya). His body existed before his soul existed, or, rather, that which became the human body existed prior to the soul, for, strictly, it was not a human body until it was animated by the indwelling of the soul, which resulted from the Divine inbreathing.

The creation of man was a new and definite Divine act, distinct from all other creative acts. All other creatures of whom mention is made in Gen. i, were called into being by the Divine word of power. "Let the earth bring forth," etc.; but in the creation of man no such mighty command goes forth, but instead a solemn word of deliberation and council precedes the creative act: "We will make man," or, "Let us make man." This points to the superior dignity of him who was about to be created. The language employed is highly anthropomorphic, and the word "form" (ii, 7) is the word used to designate the act of moulding by a potter; but we are not to understand, nor did the Israelites understand, that this Mosaic doctrine concerning man's origin is only another Promethean myth, in which Jehovah Elohim is represented as forming with his hands a lump of clay into a human form, and standing near it, breathing into it, as a man breathes, the breath of life. The Scripture nowhere warrants such a conclusion as this, such a passage as Job x, 8, apparently to the contrary notwithstanding. God operated invisibly in the creation of man, as he did in the creation of other animals; that is, if there had been another human being in existence, he could not have witnessed God in the act, but the act would have been cognizable by him only in its result. Strictly speak-

ing, the word "formed" is applicable only to human form; this was made out of previously existing material—the dust of the earth and those ingredients which compose it, as carbon, nitrogen, etc. But no previously existing material was transmuted into rationality. As a "living soul," in the sense in which he was a living soul, man was created, not made or in any way generated. But from the fact that the first man's body was *formed* by a distinct act out of previously existing material, it is not to be inferred that it was formed by another body being either gradually or suddenly transmuted into a human body. When the dust ceased to be dust, the next form in which it existed was that of the human body. The same ingredients entered also into the composition of the bodies of the lower animals. They also were, directly or indirectly, of the dust; and each particular lower animal was also in some sense a living soul (*nephesh chayya*), the term being the same as that applied to man. But this does not so much betray a want of suitable descriptive phrases, on the part of the Hebrew language, to apply to the two cases respectively, as it teaches that even man, in respect to one aspect of his origin, was linked to lower nature; for only by being thus linked to it, could the lower physical and animal world find its answer and fulfillment in him.

§2. *Man in His Sexual Aspect.*

"Male and female created he them." (Gen. i, 27.) This statement anticipates the subsequent account of the creation of the female in ch. ii, 21, 22. There were two acts in creation altogether distinct in point of time. First the male body was created out of the dust

of the ground, in such way as to render it decomposable to dust again. Then the female was formed out of a part of the man which could be spared without interfering with the harmony and integrity of the male body. It was no less a perfect body after the formation of the female than it was before. The male could perceive that the female was in all respects the counterpart of himself, her bones and flesh corresponding exactly to his, which he also perceived was not so in the case of any other creature. The phrase, "This now is bone of my bone," etc., implies that the idea of a helpmeet, or counterpart, or one who could afford him companionship, had already been present in his mind, but that he had not found it in reality. "This now," or "this at last," is the language of rest or satisfaction, after a search, the object sought for being found. The female, also, was therefore appropriately called *Adam*, as both the male and female of the winged creatures, for example, were called fowl or bird. But the account distinguishes the sex of man above that of the lower animals, in that in the case of the latter no details are furnished in regard to the creation of the male and female of the several species respectively. We are told only the fact that God created them, the remarkable formula being used: "And Elohim said, *Let the earth bring forth.*" But we do not know whether all the lower animals of any one given species are the offspring of one original couple or not. But as the first man had evidently observed the presence of sex in the lower creations, so he had evidently observed the absence of it in the case of himself; he felt that he was incomplete. This also, as well as the letter of the narrative, would seem to preclude us from

believing that Adam was originally so constructed as to propagate his species in any such manner as the tree propagates itself by means of a bud. Eve was in no sense an afterthought of the Creator. Nor did the Israelites believe, nor did Mosaic revelation teach that the first man was in any sense androgynous, involving, in some mysterious manner, both sexes in one person. The Mosaic doctrine does not admit of such construction, nor was such the belief of the earliest contemporaries of the Israelites in so far as the oldest inscriptions have made their belief known to us. But the opinion that man was created double did come into vogue, and has been held by many from remote times. It is a false exegesis, based originally, perhaps, on the separation in the Mosaic narrative of Gen. i, 27, from ch. ii, 7, though it is more difficult to account for the belief in the case of remote heathen tribes.*

The female counterpart of himself, of whose origin he was in some way made aware, Adam called woman (*Ishsha*), because she was taken from man (*Ish*). Therefore, or in view of the manner and purpose of her

*An old rabbinical interpretation says that Adam and Eve were formed back to back, united at the shoulders, and were hewn asunder. Eugubinus among Christian commentators, the Rabbis Samuel, Manasseh Ben-Israel, and Maimonides among the Jews, have given the weight of their opinion to support this interpretation [the double sex of Adam]. The Rabbi Jeremiah Ben-Eleazer, on the authority of the text: "*Thou hast fashioned me behind and before.*" (Ps. cxxxix, 4) argued that Adam had two faces, one male and the other female and that he was of both sexes. The Rabbi Samuel Ben-Nahaman held that the first man was created double, with a woman at his back, and that God cut them apart. "Adam," said other rabbis, "had two faces and one tail, and from the beginning he was both male and female—male on one side, female on the other; but afterward the parts were separated. An Indian tradition is to this effect:

creation, says the inspired writer of Genesis, "Shall a man forsake his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh." According to Mosaism, therefore, though not according to the universal practice of the Mosaic and subsequent times, marriage is a *divine institution*, and one of inviolable sanctity, one man being joined to one woman only, and for life. So it was in the divine intention, and so the Israelites knew it was to be, though many of them practiced polygamy. The animal was to be wholly subordinate to the rational and spiritual. The possession of children was looked upon from the beginning, not as the mere result of animal pleasure, but as a divine blessing (Gen. iv, 1, 25; xxix, 32, etc.), and unfruitfulness as a divine curse, and in ancient Israel no trace "can be found of the custom of killing children to ward off the increase of family cares, which is so widely spread in heathenism" (Oehler).

§ 3. *Man in his Racial Aspect.*

The human male and female were not created at one and the same time, the latter being derived from the

Whilst Brahma, the creator, was engaged in the production of beings, he saw Kaya (body) divide itself into two parts, of which each part was a different sex, and whence sprang the human race. According to a much more explicit version, Viradi, the first man, finding his solitude intolerable, fell into the deepest sorrow; and, yearning for a companion, his nature developed into two sexes, united in one. Then he separated into two individuals, but found in that separation unhappiness, for he was conscious of his imperfection; then he reunited the existence of the two portions, and was happy, and from that union the world was peopled. In Persia, Meschia and Meschiane, the first man and the first woman were said to have formed originally but one body; but they were cut apart, and from this voluntary union all men are sprung.—*Baring Gould's Legends of the Patriarchs and Prophets.*

former by a second and distinct creative process. "As in the absolute One there is no duality, whether in sex or in any other respect, so is there none in the original form and constitution of man," so the natural unity of the first pair, and of the race descended from them, is established by the primary creation of an individual, from whom is derived by a second creative process, the first woman.*

In this absolute unity of man lies the absolute unity of the race, every individual member of it, including even the first mother, having its unit and representative in the first man. Only human beings can, in the strictest sense, be said to constitute a race. The account of the creation of these is the account of the creation of first *one* human being and then another from him; from these two also other human beings descended by procreation. Such is the constant assumption of the Scriptures from the beginning onward, and such was the belief of the early Israelites. Only a subsequently developed national exclusiveness could have a tendency to give rise to any other belief; and perhaps even this never became so intense in the case of the Israelites as to manifest itself in a denial that God "made of one blood all the nations of the earth," and that each member, or individual, of the human kind was connected with every other as members of the same family, though the Israelites greatly misapprehended the Messianic relation in which they stood to other nations.

But in the case of vegetables and the lower animals the substance of all that was said was, "And God said 'Let them be,' and they were;" and the further fact

*See Murphy on Gen, ii, 21-25.

that such a law was imposed upon each genus or species as to cause it to reproduce "after its kind" and in no other way. But whether there was more than one individual, or one couple, of each distinct species created, we are not informed. The distinction between man and the angels is even more marked. There is no race of angels in any sense, but only numerous individual angels, each one being the result of an entirely independent and distinct creative act.*

They "neither marry nor are given in marriage," and consequently the word "hereditary" can in no sense be used of them, and there is nothing equivalent to what we call consanguinity, linking one with another. Each angel represents only himself. Each stands or falls for himself alone, involving no other to any extent, only in so far as another may come under

*If the words of our Savior in Matt. xvii, 21, "This kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting," refer to fallen angels, rather than to the disembodied spirits of dead and wicked men, he surely does not use the word *kind*, or species, in such a sense as to imply that the word *race* is at all applicable to angelic beings, whether fallen or unfallen. There are doubtless different classes, or orders, of angels, but they do not grow or reproduce themselves. They increase in numbers only as they are created by direct divine act, and the term *species* is applicable to them only as it is applicable to *metal* or *tin*. The word *race* is not always the equivalent of *genus*. Mere resemblances among things, or beings, however numerous these resemblances may be, are not sufficient to constitute them a race. In order that they may be a race, the existence of the one must in some sense depend upon and spring from that of another, and each term of the series must be in the image and likeness of the preceding. As the horse species can by no sort of process be caused to produce the sheep species of animal, so also in so far as man was made in the image of God, he must have been a direct creation, for no earthly creature existed in the image of God before him from whom he could have sprung.

the sway of his stronger moral influence. There is no brotherhood of angels. Only of the human kind can brotherhood be predicated; and "from this wide circumference Scripture never recedes. Even when it recounts the fortunes [or prescribes the mission, or predicts the future] of a single individual, family, or nation, its eye and interest extend to the whole race; and it only dwells on the narrower circle of men and things as the potential spring of nascent, growing, and eternal life and blessing of the whole race" (Murphy).

§ 4. *In the Image of God.*

"And God said, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.'"^{**}*

*Or, "And Elohim said, 'We will make man,'" etc. I do not think that the plural expression "we will make" hints at any degree of polytheism within the sphere of revelation, or on the part of the writer of Genesis; nor does it contain a suggestion of the Trinity, or of the Divine Majesty. As in the case of the plural Elohim, so remote and vague a suggestion of the Trinity could have scarcely been distinguished during the early history of the Israelites from polytheism—the very error against which it was so earnestly desired to protect them—though they may have held with more or less clearness the doctrine of the Trinity. It may suggest the Trinity to us, but it could not have done so to the first readers of the passage, and this latter is the main point. And as for the plural of majesty, or royal "we," aside from the fact that such a use of the pronoun is extremely rare in the Old Testament, and perhaps altogether unknown to the writer of Genesis, the pronoun "I," when God speaks, is vastly more royal than "we." How would it do to substitute "we" for "I" in this passage: "Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth?" and in other similar ones? It would not do at all. The expression under consideration is a question. If the author had been using the indirect style of discourse, he might have written, "And said that He would make man," using the singular instead of the plural verb. But he puts words into the mouth of God, still using the word Elohim in the sin-

(Gen. i. 26). "So God created man [man essentially, as including both sexes] in his own image, in the image of God, created he him" (Ver. 27).

As compared with the lower living creatures, the crowning and essential distinction of man is that he was created in the image and likeness of God; as compared with the angels, his essential distinction being that he was given a body and such facilities and properties as were due to, or rendered necessary by, the indwelling therein of spirit and the image of God. Eliminate from man this "image and likeness," and he would neither be sinless man nor sinful man, but such a being as, so far as we know, God has never created. Man is, therefore, a duplex being, allied on the one side of his nature to God and the angels, and on the other to the physical and animal. When God created the plants and lower animals, he created them in "the image and likeness" of the ideas, or models, of each species respectively, which had been in his infinite

singular sense, as he had done in the preceding instances in this chapter. Elohim, with him, is still one and the only one. I conceive that he quotes him here as saying "*we will make*," because in the revelation vision (whether real or poetical) Elohim was represented to him as addressing the intelligent and holy beings whom he had already created. Doubtless these had witnessed with great joy and expression of praise the creative acts just described, and now Elohim by way of loving concession, as a father to his children, says to them: "We will now make man in the same image and likeness as you and I are. He also shall be one of the sons of God." Nor does this view at all require that we should go to the extreme of ancient Jewish vagaries in regard to angelic co-operation with God in the work of creation, though it postulates the generally admitted fact that the existence of angelic beings was recognized in the earliest ages, even where there had been no direct supernatural revelation on the subject. See my article on Elohim in Gen. i, in "The Old Testament Student," April, 1887.

mind from eternity. But the model by which he created man was himself. Him he created in his own image, the word likeness being added merely for the sake of making the statement emphatic, as appears from its omission in verse 27, as well as from the difficulty that exegetes have in detecting any difference, except, perhaps, a very metaphysical one, between it and the word "image." If a distinction of meaning between the two words be insisted upon, we may suggest that "image" denotes the mould, or model which God had in his mind in forming man, while "likeness" denotes the resemblance which man, on being formed, bore to that image, or to God.

But what idea is intended to be conveyed by this figurative expression? The answer is to be sought from Mosaism itself; and it immediately occurs to us that, so far at least as the human image of God is concerned, the Mosaic doctrine of God must be regarded as closely allied to the Mosaic doctrine of man. The Israelites, as we have seen, were both directly and indirectly forbidden by the Mosaic teachings to have any materialistic conceptions of God whatever. They could scarcely, therefore, have regarded man as made in the image of God in respect to his material body or form. Yet some have presumed to infer from this human image of God "that God also has a bodily form like to man, which is related by way of prototype to the human form." But this surely is not the interpretation which Mosaism puts upon its own teachings, nor has it at any time been the received view of the church.*

*Audius, or Audaeus, a Syrian reformer of the fourth century, was the founder of a sect, embracing for a time a considerable following, known as the Anthromorphites. He believed that God possessed, not a perfect human body, but a human

But does not the Pentateuch and subsequent scriptures speak of a “form” of God, his hands, eyes, etc.? Yes, but that the Israelites themselves regarded such expressions as mere anthropomorphisms is evident from the Mosaic teachings concerning God. Such modes of speech are not peculiar to men in an early stage of religious advancement, but are the common resort of all men in all times, when speaking of the Divine Being. Nor were the Israelites, as the very genius of their language indicates, sufficiently advanced in metaphysical speculation to interpret the words as teaching that God has an invisible, spiritual, bodily form of some sort, like unto which man was made. The human material body was not regarded as a copy of a Divine spiritual body. They did not think that God was really anthropomorphic, though they may have thought of him as anthropomorphic. It is best to regard the passage as teaching, both ourselves and the Israelites, that God created man an intelligent, immortal, personal being, with powers of thought, and possessed of a sinless moral nature, and capable of exercising dominion. Man could recognize himself as differing, in these respects, from

shape, and, of course, the form of human limbs; and that the fashion of the human body was copied from the Divine shape, to which the Scriptural term, *image of God*, is to be referred. Tertullian, before him, holding that soul and spirit are the same, had used the following language: “The soul, therefore, is endowed with a body; for if it were not corporeal, it could not desert the body.” (*Treatise on the Soul*, ch. v.) “We, on our part, however, do here maintain, and in a special treatise on the subject prove, that soul is corporeal, possessing a peculiar kind of solidity in its nature, such as enables it both to perceive and suffer.” (*On the Res. of the Flesh*, ch. xvii.) “For who will deny that God is a body, although God is a spirit? For spirit has a bodily substance of its own kind, in its own form.” (*Against Præteas*, ch. vii.)

all the living creatures around him. He and the angels were the sons of God, because they were like him, being created in his image; and hence he and they alone were capable of receiving revelations from him. In harmony with this greater dignity of his nature, is the greater nobility of man's bodily form, it being the only one in which God has ever manifested himself to man. Divinity as resident in the body of one of the lower animals is a conception of the grossest heathenism, and one which Mosaism could not tolerate.

§5. *The Names Adam and Ish.*

So far at least as the name is concerned, no certain light is shed upon the Old Testament doctrine of man. "Adam" does not seem to have been the first name which man bore. The first instance in which the man applies any name to himself at all is in Gen. ii, 23, where he speaks of himself in contradistinction from her who had been created from him to be his companion, here calling himself *Ish* and the woman *Ishsha*. As compared with other names applied to him, the term *Ish* designates him as distinguished from woman, and as related to woman. At least this seems to be the opinion of the Hebrew lexicographers; though if the word has this *meaning* as well as this designation, it implies that man in the very name by which he knew himself was furnished a prophecy of his coming counterpart, for he could not know himself as *male* or as *husband* without knowing another as female or as wife. But after all, this is only a sense which came to be attached to the word *Ish* (or its equivalent in the language of the first man), on account of Adam's saying on the creation of woman. It embodies no hint of Adam's in-

completeness as a being; it offers no prophecy to him concerning the creation of her in whom he should find completion. Adam knew the name before the woman was made, but it looks from him backward, and not from him forward. He was called Ish, not because of his sex, but because he was nature's nobleman, the crowning act of God's creative work, the one to whom, by reason of the qualities with which he was endowed, God could delegate authority and dominion over "every living thing that moveth upon the face of the earth." Man called woman Ishsha because he saw she was like himself, and the only created being in whom he could find companionship. But we do not know when the term Adam (*adham*) was first applied to man "And God said, 'Let us make man.'" Here the word used is *adham*.

But it is most reasonable to suppose that the inspired writer merely intends to present the Creator as using the term in a general sense, signifying nothing more than that he would now make the first father of that race, which in our day is called *Adam*, or man. God gave the first man no name, leaving him to name himself, as he named the other living creatures. When, and by whom, and for what reason, the term *Adam*, or its more ancient lexical equivalent, was first applied to him, we do not know. Various theories have been proposed concerning the origin and meaning of the word. The younger Delitzsch thinks he has found it in an Assyrian root, and says that it means "the begotten one," or "the created one." Knoble and others derive it from an Ethiopian root, according to which man was called *Adam* because he was comely of form. Others, still, derive the name from *dam*, *blood*, holding

that man was first so called because of his red, or ruddy complexion. The common view makes the word signify "the earth-born," the one who was made of the dust of the ground, with the added thought that he must also return to it, a name, therefore, significant of sorrow and lowness. According to this opinion the name was applied to man in view of what he became after the fall, and has reference to his mortality rather than to his origin. The elder Delitzsch holds that the word denotes one who was made from the ground, but that the point of significance in the name is, not that man is therefore lowly and mortal, but that one made from the ground should ever be so honored as to be endowed with the image of God. But it is by no means probable that such is the reason why the Pentateuch and the Scriptures generally, call man by the name *Adam*. Here and there the inspired writers and teachers doubtless use the term in a specially significant sense, but for the most part it was used by them as it was used in the every-day speech of the people, simply to designate a being or class of beings, without attaching any etymological significance to it whatever. And least of all is it probable that he was called *Adam* by way of contrasting his earthly origin with the Divine image in which he was created. If there is any Hebrew term at all which denominates man according to his more exalted dignity as an intelligent, moral being, made in the image of God, and thus distinguished from all other earthly creatures, that term would seem to be *ish*. Whenever in the Old Testament a special word is wanted to designate man in this aspect of his nature, *ish* is the one used; and in relation to the female only *ish*, or man as *ish*, could be-

come a husband, a term which is never applicable to the lower animals. "And Adam 'knew' his wife;" the term "knew" which is invariably used in such connections as this being doubtless significant of the fact that the sexual relation between man, *ish*, and woman as *ishsha*, is something higher than the mere animal gratification which obtains between the two sexes of the lower living creatures. The term *Adam* might be applied to man before the fall, but only in a general sense, or only as a name distinguishing him generically from other creatures; whereas the word *ish* suggests not only a difference between him and other creatures, but also his intellectual and moral superiority over the latter. But man's form is to be regarded as in no sense the basis of his nobler name, except in so far as the form is the outward expression and embodiment of the nobler. Adam named the lower animals according to his impressions of them (Gen. ii, 19). He named himself also, and the term which he would apply to himself would doubtless be expressive not merely of a difference between himself and other animals, but of a crowning difference, of that higher nature in him which made him essentially more than the animal, and essentially above the animal. The word *adam* may have any one of the meanings above mentioned, but on none of these accounts did he give name to himself. The time was not yet come for him to apply any term to himself that would suggest to him the lowness of his origin, or the sorrows and sufferings of life. He did not name his body, and only his body was formed from the dust. By whatever name he called himself, whether *ish*, or the term of which *ish* is the Hebrew representative, he doubtless named him-

self in reference to his higher nature, and the name clung to him as did also the higher nature, notwithstanding the wreck which sin ere long made of it. He was always something more than an animated body, and always more than an animal.

§6. *Body, Soul, Spirit.*

The language of the Scriptures is not the language of philosophy, nor were the Israelites a philosophical people. If during any period of their national history they had anything partaking of the nature of a well developed Psychology it has not come down to us. The divine revelation which was given to them, and through them to us, is not a revelation of psychological, or other scientific facts, only in so far as these pertain to its great theme, which is the Divine purpose of redemption. Its rule in regard to matters of science, as distinguished from matters of religion, is simply to give us the theories of the day, in so far as suited to its purpose, without entering into the question of their accuracy.

In view even of these considerations, we are already prepared to believe that neither the Pentateuch nor any subsequent part of the Old Testament presents any theory of its own concerning the psychological constitution of man's nature. It speaks of *man*; God reveals himself to *man*; man dies; man sinned; man should be holy. It uses the terms *flesh* (*basar*), *soul* (*nephesh*), and *spirit* (*ruach*); but it is man's body, man's soul, and man's spirit. It nowhere teaches the doctrine of trichotomy. It speaks in harmony with the common consciousness of man, which to him is also a revelation itself, and the necessary postulate and basis of all

other revelations. And human consciousness knows only two substances, matter and that which is not matter; or, spirit and that which is not spirit. The Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testaments, use the terms soul and spirit in their popular sense, just as they are used by ourselves. The Scriptures do not dogmatize here; and if the Israelites speculated on the subject at all, beyond the simple testimony of the individual consciousness, it is quite likely that they differed among themselves, as scholars do in these days. But their differences are not a part of the Bible. The Bible commits itself to no theory; and a strictly scientific Biblical Psychology is not a possibility, only in so far as it is possible to ascertain the Scriptural sense of certain terms. It has been unduly sought to reduce the above mentioned and certain kindred terms to scientific technicalities, whereas they are the words only of popular speech, and popular speech antedates science and also outlasts it. Many a man recognizes the existence of the two words *soul* and *spirit*, and has constant occasion to use them who never thinks of the soul and spirit as being two distinct substances, and each distinct from matter. So does the Bible use these terms, and so did the Israelites. If a person should write a history of England, however useful and accurate it might be, it would not be prejudicial to the character of his book as history, to say that it would be impossible to construct the various psychological terms found in the book into dogmatic psychological formulae. Nevertheless, more or less definite theories of trichotomy have, it is thought by their advocates, been found in the Scriptures, and even in the Pentateuch. The one which has been more

commonly adopted than any other, and which is also the simplest and most intelligible, is that the body is the material part of man's constitution, while the soul (*nephesh*) is the principle of animal life, or that which distinguishes his life as an animal from mere plant life. The spirit (*ruach*) is that in man which reasons, wills, is immortal, of which moral character can be predicated, in short, that higher nature or entity of man which distinguishes him from the mere animals. It is that in which the image of God inheres.

The immaterial elements of man's nature which he possesses in common with the brutes, constitute *soul*. The immaterial, yet essentially different, elements of his nature, which he has in common with the angels, but which brutes do not possess, is spirit. This analysis of man's nature is in some sense correct, for he obviously does possess something besides the material body, in common with the lower animals, and he also possesses something only in common with the angelic beings; but so far as the *usus loquendi* of the terms soul and spirit (or *nephesh* and *ruach*) is concerned the theory is not Scriptural, nor is it to be regarded as anti-Scriptural.

A second phase of the trichotomistic theory denies that the soul is that which man possesses in common with the brutes, and yet affirms that it is different from spirit. It is a third substance which originates not from the body and which pertains not to the body, but is produced by the spirit and pertains to it. The spirit is light (so to speak), while the soul is the effulgence or quality of luminosity which belongs to the light. The soul is related to the spirit as life is to the principle of life. It is the life principle that produces life; it is the

spirit which produces soul. Spirit is the cause, soul is the effect. Soul does not belong to the body—or flesh—side of man's nature, but it is the mediating link of the spirit and the body; the form in which the personality of the spirit expresses itself. God breathed into man the spirit, and the spirit takes hold on the flesh as soul, and as such manifests itself. If man had no spirit he could have no soul.*

A third phase of trichotomy holds that the soul is the *result* of the union between spirit and flesh, and is hence different from both, as water differs from both hydrogen and oxygen, of which it is the combination. This seems to be the view of Oehler. As in general soul (*nephesh*) originates in the flesh (*basar*) by the union of spirit with matter, so is the soul the result of the inbreathing of spirit by the Creator into the material frame of the human body. Man *is soul* but *has spirit*. The soul thinks, loves, etc., while the impulse to act precedes from the spirit. And yet, according to Oehler the soul and spirit are not co-ordinate elements of man's constitution. The two original elements are spirit and flesh, or body, the soul, which is the *compositum*, or result of the union, being of the same nature as the spirit.†

But the Scriptures do not seem to me to teach any such metaphysical psychology, neither directly nor by legitimate inferences, and least of all are we to suppose that such views fairly represent either the average or the advanced Israelite. Man has even more than three faculties and there are three sides, or aspects, to his being, a material, an animal and a rational or divine;

*See Delitzsch's Biblical Psychology, ii, Sec. iv.

†See Oehler's Old Testament Theology.

but he is not composed of three substances. These facts an inspired teacher was not needed to make known. Apart from his body he is a unit; and soul (*nephesh*), and spirit (*ruach*) are very often used interchangeably, and without apparent preference, even when applied to man. But even in these instances the two terms are not synonyms. The Scripture has use for both, even as we still have use for both, and for the very reason that while the immaterial nature of man is one and indivisible, it may, and often must, be regarded as having two sides or aspects. On the one hand he has the animating principle, the vital, moving sensitive body which the lower animals also have. In this respect he differs both from the plants and from the angels, for the one have not the animating and sentient principle and the others have not bodies. In this sense man is a soul; and if the Scriptures had occasion to use the term more particularly applicable to this side of his nature, it would prefer the word soul (*nephesh* or *psuche*); but plants and angels are never called souls. On the other hand, man is also a moral and rational being; and if it were desired to emphasize this side of his nature, the more appropriate term would perhaps be spirit (*ruach* or *pneuma*). But the Scriptures do not nicely discriminate between the two words. It applies both to animals and to man. This of itself would seem to definitely oppose any trichotomistic view of man's nature so far as any argument based upon Scripture usage of certain terms is concerned. For if man is a triplex being, having body, soul, and spirit, three distinct essences or substances, so also is the brute, for each of the three terms is also applied to the brutes in the Scriptures. The soul of man and the

spirit of man are the same *thing* essentially; his soul being simply the spirit existing under certain conditions. If we knew all the conditions under which the angels exist we might have occasion to call them by another name than *spirits*. The lower animal has a spirit, and the peculiarity of condition under which it is placed constitutes that spirit a soul. The spirit in one man is *essentially* the same as the spirit of another man. But the spirit of a man is *essentially* a *different* spirit from that of the brute, and it is also differently environed, and as the soul of the brute is only the spirit of the brute existing under its peculiar conditions, it follows of course that soul of man and the soul of the brute are different both in essence and in properties. The one is rational, immortal, created in the image of God, while the other is not; while at the same time there are some things which may be, and actually are, common to both.

B. MAN AS AFFECTED BY SIN.

§1. *The Probation and Fall.*

Jehovah God, having created man, and from him the woman, placed them in the Garden of Eden, or of Pleasantness, not for the purpose of living there in luxurious idleness, but to dress it and to keep it. Had he fulfilled this part of his mission, the whole earth might ultimately, as the race multiplied, have become a garden of Pleasantness. But, though the first human pair were created sinless, they were not in the strict sense holy. Mere innocence, or sinlessness, is not holiness; the one being a negative term, implying the mere absence of something, while the

other is a positive term, denoting the presence or possession of something. Holiness implies sinlessness, but sinlessness does not imply holiness. Strictly speaking, holiness on the part of moral beings, other than God, is something to be attained, and implies the putting forth of a volition, or choice, to that end. This the first pair were capable of doing, but had as yet no occasion to do. They were also in a state of harmony with nature, and hence to labor, or dress the garden and keep it, was not to toil and struggle. To exercise dominion over nature implied neither opposition on nature's part, nor violence on theirs. They were also in a state of conditional exemption from death. It was possible for him not to die; it might become possible for him to die. In the former case he might have been transfigured and translated.

But the very fact that man was created a rational and free moral being, implied that he must have in him the capability of choice. There can be no virtue when there is no choice. There can be no choice when there is nothing to chose. Hence a test was inevitable. The imposition upon man of a test was only the necessary Divine process or method, whereby God made man a being of whom virtue or holiness might be predicated. This test is already implied in the fact that he was created in the Divine image. The Israelitish conception of the test of which we have an inspired account in Gen. ii, 17, was that of a prohibitory command. So, indeed, in the very nature of the case, it must have been. The conviction was divinely communicated to him in the very constitution of his moral nature, that some things he might do, and other things he might not do with impunity.

His moral nature was not created, and this conviction communicated to it afterward, but the conviction was an essential part, or constituent of the moral nature. This conviction only needed to have, and sooner or later must necessarily have had, a definite case in point, so to speak, on which to be exercised by man's free volition. The pictorial, yet inspired, Mosaic account represents this case in point as being a tree of the knowledge, or tree of the choice of good and evil, and a prohibition to eat of its fruit. Had the prohibition to murder been the first test imposed, it would obviously have been both impracticable and unsuitable; impracticable because there was no one for him to murder, for instance, and unsuitable because it furnished no appeal to the first man's sinless nature, which could in any sense be called a test. But the time would come when both this and many other commandments would be both practicable and needed prohibitions. But for the present man's conviction of right and wrong, in general, must be divinely directed to something in particular, and that something must lie within the sphere of man's action; and it would seem that it must also be of such a nature as to teach man, at the outset, that the standard of right and wrong must for him be simply the will of God. These appear to be at least some of the truths which lie between the lines of Gen. ii, 16, 17. There may have been a real "tree of the knowledge of good and evil," and its ripe fruit may have fallen off from day to day and decayed. But the deepest and truest loyalty to the Bible does not require us to believe that it was necessarily a literal material tree. The Hebrews were characteristically inclined to pictor-

ial rather than abstract representation of truths, and Jehovah, in communicating to them his revelations, could and did employ such forms as were best suited to their natural genius and modes of conception. Behind the plain, simple and altogether unaffected and concrete style of the story, lie the spiritual facts in the case, and these facts were what the Israelites saw in the story, though perhaps not with such clear vision as we may see them.

1. Aside from the view of the moral constitution of man's nature, already referred to, the pictorial narrative under consideration discloses that side by side with a sinless spirit world, of which the Israelites were made cognizant, there already existed, before man was created, a great kingdom of evil powers and intelligences in the heavens, or outside of the natural sphere of man, presided over by a master spirit, who stood in antagonism to God.

From this master evil spirit came the motive, or suggestion, to man of a volition in opposition to the will of God, and which actually resulted in all the darkness of human experience and human story, and which has ever been alike perplexing to Hebrew, heathen and Christian morality.*

2. The narrative also discloses, not only a fact upon which a supernatural revelation placed its endorsement, but one which was currently accepted by the ancient

*In the later Jewish theology "the fall of Adam is ascribed to the envy of the angels—not the fallen ones, for none were fallen till God cast them down, in consequence of their seduction of man. The angels, having in vain tried to prevent the creation of man, at last conspired to lead him into sin, as the only means of his ruin—the task being undertaken by Sammael (and his angels), who in many respects were superior to the other angelic

Israelites, that man was not made as they then knew him, and as we now know him, but began his existence in a state of perfect harmony with his God, and with the recognition of the fact that His will was to be the standard of his conduct and that continued conformity thereto was the condition upon which this harmony was to be maintained. This fact necessarily in its negative or prohibitory form, is veiled in the narrative, under the symbol, or pictoral representation of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, of the fruit of which they were forbidden to eat. Any violation on his part of any prohibition of God would necessarily destroy his harmony with God, throw him into a state of positive discord with Him, and place him in communion with the kingdom of evil. The fact suggested the form of the inspired narrative, and the inspired narration was the embodiment of the fact already painfully known. It was also known that the temptation to disobey, whatever the specific prohibition may have been, overcame man, a belief sanctioned by supernatural revelation, with the further fact that it was done by means of the art of a personal source of evil, extraneous to himself.

3. This personal source of evil is represented in the narrative as a serpent. This, too, is the pictorial representation of a fact. It is not to be supposed that the Israelites believed that a literal serpent, of what-

princes. The instrument employed was the serpent, of whose original condition the strangest legends are told, probably to make the biblical narrative appear more natural."—*Edersheim's "Life and Times of Jesus."* But this was not the doctrine of Mosaism, nor of the Israelites of Moses' time. It is only a specimen of the haggadic exegesis of the Rabbis.

ever sort, entwined itself about the tree, and held literal converse with Eve. The form of the narrative is only another way of saying that the temptation came from a personal evil being that was already in antagonism with God, and that it was presented in a cunning guise, best calculated to accomplish the end aimed at. This is the only essential fact set forth in this part of the narrative, and the only one which the Great Revealer thought it necessary for us to know. The supposed fact that the Israelitish doctrine of a personal Satan was not elaborated until long after the time of Moses, or that there are in the Pentateuch no express allusions to a personal Satan, does not at all forbid us to say that the serpent of the narrative is only another name for their personal Satan. This doctrine may have been, and doubtless was, conspicuously present in the popular Israelitish mind, as it was in the case of the nations about them, and yet the inspired writer may, for good reasons, have suppressed all direct allusions to it in the Pentateuchal writings. It was incumbent upon him to employ the language of his day, and perhaps he could not speak more plainly in this case without seeming to identify the tempter of man with one of the so-called evil gods of the nations—and this he did *not* wish to do, for the Israelites were already exhibiting too marked a tendency in the direction of heathenish demonology. Or perhaps the tempter is here presented as a serpent in order that the parts of the narrative may harmonize throughout. If one of its facts or truths is to be embodied in picture, so, consistently, must the others. Nor does it fall within the scope of the Pentateuch, nor, indeed, of the whole Old Testament, to present a fully developed

Satanology. After stating the essential facts of man's origin and fall, its object is to treat of God and man, and their relations to each other, and not the mysteries of the spirit world. Man knew enough for the present concerning this. Silence is not necessarily to be construed as ignorance. Revelation, as a whole, is a growth, but this fact does not require us to believe that the silences of revelation at any given period, on any given topics, imply that there are no allusions to these topics, or that the people had no theories concerning them, however incorrect.*

4. We may inquire, but only briefly here, of what spiritual truth was the Tree of Life, of the narrative, intended to be suggestive? for it is evident that a corresponding truth in the history both of Adam and the Israelites underlay this part also of the physical imagery. As it was not to be supposed that the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil was a literal tree the eating of whose fruit resulted in the death of the body by poison; so neither is the Tree of Life to be regarded as a literal tree, the eating of whose fruit would result in physical immortality which could not be for-

*Dr. Samuel Davidson among others, says: "Those who suppose that the Devil employed the serpent as his instrument, or that the Devil alone is spoken of, are confronted by the fact that the idea of Satan was of later introduction among the Hebrews than the age of the writer [of the narrative of the fall]. The curse pronounced upon the tempter sufficiently shows that none but the agent expressly named [the literal serpent] was thought of." (Article *Adam*, Ency. Brit.) To this it may be briefly replied that, we may perhaps safely admit, so far as the Scripture requirements are concerned, that the Devil did not employ a literal serpent as his agent, but that the serpent is introduced into the narrative in order to pictorially represent what the Devil actually did do. That the idea of Satan, however, was

feited. As the spiritual fact of disobedience and its baleful consequences is represented by the physical fact of eating a certain forbidden fruit, so the spiritual fact of obedience and its consequences is represented by the inspired writer under the physical imagery of another Tree called the Tree of Life. Adam might have found immortality in his sinless state by obedience. Having disobeyed, however, in one instance, concerning which he had had explicit direction and warning, this Tree of Life was no longer accessible to him. Guilt and discord in his relation to his Maker have taken the place in him of the former harmony and peace; and this guilt and discord are a sword of flame, forever preventing him from returning to the old paradiſical state of peaceful sinlessness, and securing immortality therein by the old path of obedience. He who by his own act throws himself out of harmony with God, in that very act is expelled, or rather expels himself from Paradise. Here the narrative pauses, for the time had not yet come to give more than a brief and vague suggestion (Gen. iii, 15) of how the lost harmony and the forfeited immortality might still be secured by that "new and living way," who was also

of later introduction than the age of the writer, is an assumption which cannot be proved. On the contrary, the earliest Shemitic peoples of which the monumental records inform us, including the Egyptians, among whom the Hebrews lived, were in possession of a well defined idea of evil spirits, and of an Evil One, who outranked the others; though the satanology of Christian theology, or even of the later Jewish theology, may not have been known to the early Hebrews. And as to the "time of the writer" of the Pentateuch narrative, that would seem to be too uncertain a matter in the estimation of the school of which Dr. Davidson was an able representative, to render it of any moment as the basis of argument.

the Truth and the Life. To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the Tree of Life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God (Rev. ii, 7). As the history of redemption opens with Paradise Lost and immortality forfeited, so it closes with Paradise found and immortality secured irrevocably.

§2. *Sin.*

The historical origin of sin is, as we have seen, presented in the narrative of the fall. Its metaphysical origin and nature are left untouched in that narrative, and in the main in all other parts of the Scriptures—and this, we may say as we pass, is evidence that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are not merely one of “the sacred books of the East,” all of which are alike inspired, or alike uninspired. If the Israelites speculated on the metaphysical origin and nature of sin, as they probably did to some extent, as all races of men have done with greater or less degree of acuteness, we have in the inspired writings neither record or endorsement, nor correction, of their speculations. The most that is here revealed, and the most that has ever needed to be revealed, concerning sin in its more metaphysical aspects, is, that it is *that which*—not only that mysterious and otherwise nameless something which is opposed to the will and holiness of God, but it is also that in which this opposition originates. The Divine Being is the absolute standard both as to sovereignty and moral character; and that which does not conform to this standard, or which prevents conformity in others, is sin. This non-conformity to the standard may be considered either as negative or positive. It may be regarded, on the one hand, merely

as a *not-being* and *not-doing* that which the holy will of God requires; and sometimes it is this, and nothing more. Or, on the other hand, it may consist in being and doing that which the holy will of God forbids. But Adam at the outset was already that which the holy will of God required him to be, and hence the probational test was appropriately, if not necessarily, a prohibition, or negative command.

All that the Pentateuch reveals to us concerning the metaphysical origin of sin is that it originated in a source extraneous to man himself, and that this source was a personal being other than God. Man was already in a perfect state of harmony with God, having been so made by God himself. He could not be created over again into something that was sinful, or out of harmony with God. His natural tendency was to remain in the state in which he was created, and he would ever have continued in this state had he not been thrown out by a force extraneous to that element of himself of which moral character may be predicated; and this in turn could be accomplished, not by causing him to fail to obey a positive command, but only by inducing in him a positive act of disobedience to a prohibition.

Before sin can exist as an act, before it can exist even as a state of corruption, it must already exist as a kind of potentiality which is the basis of the act which results in corruption, the corruption in turn resulting in other sinful acts. That which is holy cannot become unholy, at least not of itself. Holiness may do wrong, but it cannot sin; it cannot commit a sinful act, and by reason of the reactionary effect upon itself be transmuted into unholiness. But innocence may

become guilt, especially if it be endowed with the dangerous attribute of free-will. But guilt is simply sin in its relation to the Divine will, while moral pollution is sin in its relation to the Divine holiness. Innocence endowed with free-will is, then, the mysterious potentiality through which sin, which existed before only as an idea, became actual. In itself, this potentiality, of course, possesses no moral quality, because it is not a person, and moral quality can be strictly predicated only of persons. Sin at first, then, so far as man or angel is concerned, is only a defect, consisting in the fact that an innocent moral nature could not be endowed with free-will without rendering sin, in its real and positive aspects, a possibility. And yet this negative sin is not such a defect as must necessarily in process of time develop into something more than a defect. God made a perfect universe, including perfect angels and a perfect man. But their perfection was only relative. God being the Standard, they were imperfect, for he could make nothing as perfect as himself. The most that the nature of the case admitted of was an image and likeness of himself, which fell far below the original. We may predicate the two statements of God which are mutually contradictory, viz., he is absolutely free, and yet that it is impossible for him to sin. But we can predicate these two statements of neither man nor angel. The most that can be said of these is, that in the first instance, they were without sin, and, being endowed with free-wills, they might or might not progress from negative sinlessness to positive holiness.

But the first human pair, as we have seen, moved in the opposite direction—that is, from negative sinless-

ness to positive sinfulness, both as to inward state and outward act. Sin ceased, with man, to be a mere possibility; it became a permanent affection of his inward being, a state of discord with God, the ultimate standard of holiness and right, and this inward condition man manifested outwardly by both doing what God had forbidden and failing to do what He had commanded. The Israelites of the Mosaic period recognized sin in these two aspects, and they also recognized the inward as being the source of the outward, though it was reserved for Prophetism and the teachings of Christ in the Gospels to lay special emphasis on this latter fact. But in the Old Testament twelve different words are used to denote sin in its several phases, while at least eleven of these are found in the Pentateuch. Some of these present sin as an inward state of moral perversity, or destitution of worth, or ruin, or sorrow and misery, etc., while others present it as an act of perversity, or treachery, or revolt, or staying from God, etc. The fact stated in Gen. viii, 21, that "the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth," was ever recognized as true, witnessed as it was both by supernatural revelation and the testimony of the human religious consciousness. The very fact that the Israelites apprehended, to some extent at least, the terms in which the supernatural revelation of any given truths was expressed, is evidence that there was in the people a basal element of knowledge to begin with; and, on the other hand, the fact that the religious and theological conceptions of the Israelites were so far in advance of those of adjacent peoples is evidence that the Israelites had something more than the mere outgrowth of a religious consciousness.

§ 3. *Death.*

“But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” Gen. ii, 17. “In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.” Gen. iii, 19. These are the basal texts. The *thou* in this passage was the physical Adam—man’s body; so, at least in the primary and natural sense at least, and so Adam’s posterity understood it. “And he died,” is the epitaph of all the generations. The soul, or spirit, was not of the dust, and to the dust it could not return. We cannot know whether Adam fully understood the import of the word “death.” Perhaps he only knew that it meant something bad, or evil, just as he knew that the promise in iii, 15, meant something good. In either case, if he knew more, the greater knowledge was due to further supernatural revelation which the author of the account did not record. But as for his posterity, they did not first speak of the death of the soul, or spirit, or death in what we now call the figurative or spiritual sense, and then afterward transfer the word to the sphere of the physical. If this were true, physical death would be figurative death, and spiritual death would be the literal. But men do not reason from the spiritual to the material, but from the material to the spiritual. Breath, or *spiritus*, is not so called because it resembles spirit, but spirit is so called because it resembles breath, or *spiritus*. Men talked of physical death, and then by figure of speech afterward transformed the word to the sphere of the spiritual; and in

the physical sense the word is used uniformly not only in the Pentateuch, but in the subsequent parts of the Old Testament. To die was to put the body back into the condition in which it was before God breathed into man the breath of life, and he became a living soul, thence further back still by a process of material dissolution and decay to original dust. This is the first and obvious meaning of the word, and it is the only sense in which the word was used by the Israelites. Literal death cannot be predicated of spirit, for spirit exists only in so far as it lives. It may become more and more vital, it may develop along the line of its essential powers or attributes, but it cannot die, only in the sense of being annihilated. If left to itself, it would exist, and hence live forever, because it has no power over its own being.

"In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" or, in other words, "so sure as thou eatest, so sure shalt thou die"—the one fact will follow just as surely as the other fact has occurred, though it may not follow immediately in the fullest sense. The expression does not affirm the exact time when it shall follow, but it is rather the definite statement that it certainly will follow. The two events were associated with each other, however, not merely as antecedent and consequent, but as cause and effect. So it was in the mind of the writer, and so it was intended that those for whom he wrote should understand it. Death was understood by them in its plain physical sense, and was regarded as the effect, not of some sort of poisonous quality in the fruit, but of the act of disobedience. The tree of the knowledge of good and evil was not a poisonous tree, but simply a probation or

proof-tree, the quality of whose fruit had nothing to do with the effect produced—neither in the view of the inspired writer nor of the Israelitish people. The nexus between the cause and the effect was moral not physical. By the mental resolve to disobey, or rather by the volition, which culminated in the physical act of disobedience, man's spiritual being was thrown out of harmony with God, the Source and Standard of right. The body being the spirit's abode and instrument, must share in the effect in its own way.

But as to the causal connection between sin and death, the Israelitish theology did not speculate. The whole matter was submissively referred to the sovereignty of God. Sin was, therefore, a state of alienation from God, and physical death was its physical outcome. And herein the testimony of revelation is in harmony with the testimony of the natural religious consciousness. This implies, of course, that had there been no sin, there would have been no death—no human death, at least, whatever might have been the case with the lower animals. Had man continued sinless, his body would have passed from earth, as Christ's body seemed about to do on the Mount of Transfiguration—through another gate than that of death—and, as the bodies of the saints will do, who are alive on the earth at his coming. But this is only an inference, not an express teaching, of Mosaism.

§4. *After Death.*

“ ‘Dust thou art, to dust returnest,’ was not written of the soul,” nor did the Israelites of this period of their history understand it as written of the soul.

"Death," says Delitzsch, "is a breaking up of the divinely established substance of a living being;" or, in other words, in reference to man, "the essence of death consists in the man's becoming again the same as he was."* So it is in respect to his body, but not quite so in respect to his soul or spirit. The one dissolves and becomes what it had been; the other, having been nothing previous to its embodiment, lives on, changed only so far as embodiment had conditioned its being. The Israelites believed in the continued existence of the soul for the same unrevealed reasons that we do. He was in possession of the usual arguments, which arguments were confirmed by the tacit sanction of his inspired teachers. Mosaism, it is true, nowhere expressly affirms that the soul or spirit of man, after the death of the body, continues to live in a future or invisible state; for it is not the chief function of Mosaism to deal with the mysterious questions of the future state, but rather to teach its pupils, the chosen people, how to conduct themselves aright in this life. It really, though quietly, assumes the fact of the soul's continued existence in the invisible world, constantly endorsing, in one way or another, the popular belief on the subject, without as yet explicitly correcting errors of detail. Other problems, for the present, demanded more immediate attention. The details of other lessons were first to be learned.

But while this is true, the very fact that God had entered into a covenant with Israel was proof to Israel that death did not end all. He could not fail to so construe it, whether he thoroughly understood the nature and significance of the covenant or not. He knew

*Biblical Psychology.

that it must imply that he was not the creature of a day; it would necessarily strengthen his natural suspicions of immortality. And the often repeated formula, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac," etc., who apparently died long ago, must have suggested something more to the Israelites than that Jehovah was an immortal God, or that he was once the God of men who once were, or that he was still the God of men who once were, but were now altogether dead. "*I am* the God of Abraham," meant to the subsequent Israelites the same as "*I am* Abraham's God." But one whose soul, or personality, has ceased to exist, cannot have a God. The mass of the Israelites never did, at any period of their history, fail to see the point of this argument, whatever may have been true of the Saducees of the time of our Saviour.

And the often-recurring expression, "was gathered to his fathers," which must have been a familiar one to the people, was something more than a euphemism for death or burial; nor was it a mere confession of ignorance concerning the soul of the dead man. The expression looked to the future and the invisible, and implied a belief in continued personal existence, which belief was approved by the inspired writers and teachers of the people, who, themselves, used the phrase.

The Israelitish belief in the state after death may be further tested and illustrated by assuming for the moment that they did not believe in the continued existence of the soul, but regarded themselves as being destined soon to depart into nothingness. Let this assumption be carried along and kept constantly in mind as one reads the Mosaic writings, or almost any other

part of the Old Testament. What a discord will arise between this assumption and many of their vivid utterances, even though nothing should be found in them either dogmatically or didactically about a future life. Did men who believe in no hereafter ever talk so? "Whom have I in heaven but thee, and there is none in all the earth that I desire beside thee." "Thou art our dwelling place in all generations." "Art not thou from everlasting, Jehovah, my Holy One?" "We shall not die." Or take that oft repeated Hebrew oath, "As the Lord liveth, and as thy soul liveth;" what meaning is there in such a connection of terms, this liking in thought the life of the soul with the life of Jehovah?

But how does all this lofty language immediately collapse at the presence of the low materializing idea which affirms that the soul dies with the body, and is no more, and that the ancient people of God so believed. This line of argument is worthy of being insisted upon, and I know of no one who has presented it more interestingly than Dr. Tayler Lewis, who proceeds to say: "Even the language of their despondency shows how far they (the Israelites) were from the satisfied animal or earthly state of soul; 'shall dust praise thee? Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave, or thy righteousness in the land of oblivion?' It was bidding farewell to God, not to earth; it was losing the idea of the everlasting covenant and its everlasting Author, that imparted the deepest gloom to their seasons of skepticism. It was in just such travail of spirit that the hope [of immortality] was born in them. This was the subjective mode of its revelation."*

*The Schaff-Lange *Com. on Genesis.*

The innate dread of annihilation and eternal nothingness became the natural subjective basis of a supernatural revelation of immortality, the record of which is not restricted to the more devotional writings of the Old Testament. Such passages as Job xiv, 10-12, and Ps. xxxix, 13, do not teach to the contrary, as the speakers here affirm, cessation of being only of the present mode of existence, and not absolutely. It is the language of popular speech.

The place in which disembodied souls were conceived as still existing was called *Sh'ol*, a term signifying *depth*, or *abyss*, and hence the under-world, or place of shades—the Hebrew equivalent of the Greek *Hades* and the Latin *Orsus*. It was the “other world” simply, without reference to the moral character of the souls inhabiting it. Both the good and the bad went alike to *Sh'ol*, their long home; nor is there any clear distinction made between the conditions in *Sh'ol* of the righteous and the wicked. One does not go to the Pentateuch to find instruction on the subject of future rewards and punishments;* though it is not to be in-

*The fact that the whole genius, so to speak, of the Pentateuch is in such thorough harmony with the recognized fact that the Old Testament revelation was a progressive revelation, both in respect to contents and time, is a proof, it seems to me, that it was written at a very early period of Hebrew history. And the fact that the whole genius of the Pentateuch is in such thorough harmony with the whole genius of the Hebrews at the Mosaic period of their history, is a proof, it seems to me, that it must have been written for the most part, at least, synchronously with that period. No antiquarian of the present day, with all our abundance of English records, could so thoroughly imitate the English life and thought of a thousand years ago. How much more difficult would it be to do so if our records of the English past were as meagre as the Hebrew records of their past must have been.

fferred from this that the idea of difference of future condition was not present in the early Israelitish mind. It was present even in the contemporary heathen religions, but it was not yet needful that supernatural revelation should emphasize it by calling repeated and special attention to it. Other lessons were of much more immediate urgency than this, because the other truths which these lessons inculcated would more readily slip from the mind. It was of immediate and fundamental importance that the Israelites should be taught to live in harmony with their national Messianic mission, though the details of this mission they did not thoroughly understand. Nor was it necessary for the well-being of the Israelitish church in this world that it should know many details of the next world. The essential facts it had, and these were sufficient, until such time as Christ should come and bring life and immortality to further light. And the door is only ajar even to us, but is sufficiently so for the present.

Passages like Ecel. ix, 5, 6, 10, are not to be construed as meaning that revelation taught, or that the Israelites at any period of their history believed that souls in *Sh'ol* existed in a kind of semi-conscious, dreamy condition, feeling an interest in the affairs neither of the world which they had left nor of the one into which they had entered. Such expressions as "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in *Sh'ol*, whither thou goest," mean simply that when a man dies that is the end of him, so far as his life in this mode of existence is concerned. His negative relation to the life here is described, rather than his relation, either negative or positive, to the life hereafter.

CHAPTER IV.

THE MOSAIC DOCTRINE OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

Analysis.

The term “theocracy,” by which the kingdom is usually designated, is an invention of Josephus. It was employed by him as descriptive of the government of the Israelites, as being neither a monarchy nor oligarchy, nor democracy, but a government by God himself, kings and priests being, theoretically at least, only his representatives. Church and state were essential parts of the same organism. The latter existed for the sake of the former, and the former existed for the sake of the purpose which it represented, viz.: the redemption of man.

It is convenient to consider the contents of this chapter under the three-fold division of: (A.) The kingdom of God in its essential idea and initial promises. (B.) The kingdom in its external organism. (C.) The typical and prophetical aspects of this organism.

A.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD IN ITS ESSENTIAL IDEA, ETC.

§1. *Definition of the Kingdom.*

In so far as it falls within the scope of this part of our studies, the kingdom of God may be defined as the Divine purpose of redemption, as embodied or manifested in the government and worship of Israel; or, in other words, the Israelitish state-church. As the idea of the Kingdom of God is the central idea of the whole dispensation of revelation, including both the Old and

the New Testaments; so the central idea of the kingdom, as everywhere manifested in this world, is God's purpose of redemption. But redemption contemplates not merely any given present, but also the future; not merely the individual, but also the race; not merely Israel, but also all other nations; and man himself is an intelligent and free factor of the redemptive plan. Hence the execution of the purpose must be gradual and continuous; and hence also the necessity of visible organization.

The phrase, "the kingdom of God," is applied, then, to the form which God's redemptive effort assumed from time to time in the process of bringing back the world to himself. In the earliest stages of revelation it appears only in the simply and briefly expressed purpose (Gen. iii, 15), the only memorial or symbol of which was the institution of sacrifices. The particular form in which those who have faith in the Divine purpose may organize themselves in respect to religious, social, aesthetical or other matters, does not of itself constitute the kingdom; the redemptive purpose must be recognized as present in the form, in order that its parts may have unity, and that its whole may have significance.

The kingdom of God, as distinguished from its outward and visible phases, was something abidingly present through the whole period of revelation, and is destined to exist unto eternity. Beginning with the smallness, as of a tender plant, its growth can be traced first along the line of Seth, and then of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, gradually becoming the great tree, whose branches shall shelter with their benign influence all the nations. In the later periods its central

point and capital was called by the loved name Jerusalem, on the top of whose Mount Zion the house of Jehovah should be established; and all nations were conceived as flowing unto it in marching streams, as to a common center of allegiance. "And many peoples shall go and say, Come, ye, and let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem. And he shall judge between the nations, and shall reprove many peoples; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." (Isa. ii, 2-4.) The writings of the prophets, indeed, as we shall see, abound in descriptions of the future incomparable glory of the kingdom, and of the times when its sway should be universally recognized.

Thus the kingdom of God was something ever present, and yet something ever coming; and in the later ages, where a new phase of it was already at hand, it was prescribed as the abiding prayers of its members that it might come in the yet greater and world-wide fullness of its glory and dominion (Matt. vi, 10). But the average Israelite, even during the most advanced stage of national culture, did not understand it; far more imperfectly, doubtless, was it understood by the people of the earlier day. Perhaps even the prophet sometimes spoke more wisely than he knew. The Israelites, of the Mosaic period especially, are to be regarded as having little correct conception of the meaning of it all—this promise concerning the seed of

the woman which should bruise the serpent's head, that in Abraham all the nations of the earth should be blessed, this exodus into the wilderness, this organization of the nation, this elaborate system of worship, this national exclusiveness, etc. They saw it, and yet they saw it not; not in the fullness of its import; not the particulars of the end to which it all looked. To them the end was for the most part, if not wholly, in themselves. They failed often, as a people, to regard themselves as a means to an end which included vastly more than themselves. And hence, during the long process of their instruction they were often a gain-saying and stiff-necked people. But the design of the Kingdom of God on earth, of which the Israelitish theocracy was one of the temporary visible forms, is everywhere the restoration of the world to loving allegiance to God the Father-King.

§ 2. *Initial Promises.*

The initial promises which looked to the organization of a visible kingdom of God are: (1) the Protevangelium, or first gospel, Gen. iii, 15; (2) the blessing pronounced by Noah upon Shem, Gen. ix, 26, 27; (3) the call and blessing of Abraham, Gen. xii, 1-3, and other places; (4) the blessing by Jacob upon his twelve sons, Gen. xlix.

1. *The Protevangelium, or First Gospel.*—Whatever view one may have regarding the date and authorship of the Pentateuch, he may safely hold that the Israelites of the Mosaic period were acquainted with the story of the Fall, substantially as related in Gen. iii, and with the first Gospel Promise recorded as a sequel thereto. The only way in which a later writer

could know, aside from supernatural revelation, would be by transmission from an earlier one. The curse upon the animal serpent, and through it upon the evil spirit, is to be regarded as a part of the Promise:

“Because thou hast done this, cursed be thou above all beasts and all animals of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life. And enmity will I put between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; and he shall bruise thee on the head, and thou shall bruise him on the heel.” Gen. iii, 14, 15.

The first intimation, not only of a purpose, but also of a Person, is here found in the sentence of punishment pronounced upon the Tempter immediately after the fall. The Tempter, as we have seen, was the evil spirit; even those for whom the narrative was originally and primarily written never supposing that its meaning lay wholly upon the surface. The fact which the story embodied was regarded as of more importance than the form of words into which it was cast.

Satan and all his servants, whether human or angelic, are embraced in the curse pronounced upon the serpent. The phrase, “seed of the woman,” is also used in both a generic and a personal sense. In the first place the whole of mankind is meant, between whom, even in its worst state, and Satan there is an everlasting hostility. Satan is even the worst man’s enemy, and the worst man knows this; and there is deeply rooted in him a certain, though perhaps vague and unintelligible, longing after God. His heart finds no repose till it reposes in Him. So it has ever been. It is this, indeed, that renders man open to revolt against the dominion of Satan, and makes redemption a possibility.

But in the narrower sense, "seed of the woman" means that part of the posterity of the woman who have already revolted against the kingdom of evil, and are won "as trophies of grace from the seed of the serpent, and are adopted into the seed of redemption." In a still narrower sense, however, the seed of the woman is a single person who was in a peculiar sense born of a woman. "*Thou* shalt wound *him* upon the heel." This implies a personal enemy. "*He* shalt wound thee upon the head." This implies a personal seed. The Hebrew is unambiguous, both the pronoun and the verb being of the masculine gender, and the action such as could not be predicated of a neuter.* The wound of the one is to be inflicted treacherously on the heel, and is to be relatively slight; "the other is to be on the head, to be inflicted by an individual champion of his race, and shall be without deception, and shall prove fatal." This individual victor, elsewhere called the second Adam, is the seed of the woman only, the head of his race, the one who shall re-establish the kingdom of God in all the earth in perfect peace and prosperity.

But we obtain this interpretation of the First Promise only in the light of all subsequent revelation and history. We live in the light of the high noon, and to

*Some Latin MSS., and the Vulgate of Sextus V and Clement VIII, wrongly read, "Ipsa conteret," *she shall wound*, which is construed by the Roman Catholic Church in its own interest, making the pronoun *she* refer to the Virgin Mary. But whatever doubt there may be about the unpointed Hebrew pronoun as meaning either *he* or *she*, there can be none about the gender of the Hebrew verb of which this pronoun is here the subject; it is certainly masculine, which is sufficient to determine the gender of the pronoun. The masculine suffix *nu* still further determines the gender.

us every nook and corner of the first gospel promise is opened np. But in the beginning, and for centuries afterward, it may not have been so. Gen. iii, 14, 15, was only a rift in the cloud of suffering and sorrow, and degradation, revealing a glimpse of a better day beyond. Those who believed in the verity of the glimpse, became thereby members of the kingdom of God; the unbelieving remained of the seed of the serpent.

But faith varied in vividness in those days, as it does in these. All might have seen in the promise a redeeming purpose; perhaps others saw in it also a redeeming Person, though he was presented therein only as the seed of the woman, and not as a Divine Person wholly apart from and independent of the race to be redeemed. The promise was colored in its expression by the immediate circumstances; as the sin, and sorrow, and suffering, had come by means of the woman, so also should the redemption therefrom An honor as well as a mercy was therein bestowed upon her in the outset, and the man would be only the more constrained to cleave unto her, though fallen and the cause of his own fall. Had the promise been couched in other terms than those suggested by the immediate surroundings, it would have been then and thereafter an unintelligible anachronism. The gospel could not be announced to the first pair in terms which could be suggested and understood only by means of subsequent history; and the fact that there is here no anticipation of details is evidence that it is not a purely human narrative which we read.

2. *The Blessing of Shem.* Noah said:

“Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be

unto his brethren." And he said, "Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem, and let Canaan be his servant. God enlarge Japheth, and let him dwell in the tents of Shem, and let Canaan be his servant." Gen. ix, 26, 27.

This language is to be regarded as an inspired prophecy, and not as the expression of mere personal feeling toward his children on the part of Noah. It may mean more to us than it did to those to whom it was originally addressed, or for whom it was originally written; for we see it in the light of subsequent revelations and of a larger fulfillment. But it was a part of the creed of the members of the kingdom of God, which members were of the Shemitic stock, and it entered as a basal factor in the completer visible organization of the kingdom. The Israelites were ever proud of their descent from Shem, and this prophecy concerning the posterity of their ancestor was one of the grounds of the hope which they entertained of themselves as a people. Canaan represents in the prophecy not merely himself and his descendants, but the whole family of Ham, which was ultimately to be reduced to a position, not merely of inferiority, but of degradation. Japheth was to become world-wide in his enlargement; while the family of Shem should be the center, and depository of religious thought, and particularly of the monotheistic idea. The Elohim who should abide in his tents was Jehovah, the one true God—whether it be affirmed that this one true God was known in Noah's day by the name Jehovah or not. To Shem should Japheth go for religion, and in this sense he also should dwell as a pupil in the tent of Shem. The emphasis of the prophecy is upon Shem;

and the Israelites could scarcely have construed the part relating to Japheth as meaning that he should ultimately become so enlarged as to absorb Shem. But whether Elohim or Japheth be regarded as the subject of the verb “shall dwell,” the dwelling may as a matter of fact be affirmed of both. Shem’s family did become the seat and source of the kingdom of God on earth, by reason of the fact that Elohim did dwell in his tent, first as Jehovah and subsequently as Christ; and Japheth, on terms of fraternal harmony with his brother, sits as a pupil in the same tent, and thereby becomes himself incorporated into the same kingdom.

The prophecy did not look beyond the degradation of Ham, nor did the Israelites, as a people, during any of the centuries of their national history, rightly apprehend the relation which the Hamites should ultimately hold to the kingdom. For the present, and particularly as to the descendants of Canaan (for with this branch the Israelites had more to do)—they were looked upon chiefly as outcasts, any concession which they might make to whom being a mere matter of grace. It was reserved for revelations long subsequent to Noah to disclose the fact that the Hamites also should in the distant future become a constituent part of the kingdom of which the Israelites were now the only earthly embodiment.

But there was to the Israelites in the prophecy of Noah distinctly neither a human nor a Divine Messiah; it was only Jehovah Elohim dwelling in Shem’s tents in such a sense as to make one branch in particular of that family the depository of the oracles of God, and Japheth’s family resorting thither for their religion. The details of meaning were probably left to Israelit-

ish conjecture until subsequent revelation and history should furnish the true and full interpretation.

3. *The Blessing of Abraham.* The blessing upon the three patriarchs is found in more or less varying form in Gen. xii, 1-3; xiii, 14-18; xv, 4, 5; xvii, 1.8; xviii, 17-19; xxii, 15-18; xxviii, 1-4; xxxv, 9-12.

With the call and blessing of Abraham begins a new epoch in the historical development of the Divine purpose of redemption. The foundation is laid for the appearance of the kingdom of God in visible, or organized form. The development of the Divine purpose is no longer presented as taking place through "the seed of the woman," in the general sense of that term, nor was it any longer entrusted to the whole family of Shem. It is Abraham's seed, his sons, however, by Keturah, and Hagar, and Isaac's son Esau, being excluded from the organized kingdom. But the exclusion for the present of all but the seed through Jacob was in order to the subsequent inclusion of all mankind. Of course, however, it is not to be understood that the exclusion of any persons from the covenant people, or visible kingdom, shut out all possibility of individual salvation on the part of such persons.

The blessing of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, was not only the basis of all subsequent redemptive movement, but was also the magna charta of the Israelitish nation. It was this that made the twelve tribes one people, that gave the highest significance to their national existence, and to this appeal was constantly made through the whole of their history. The constant use among the earlier Israelites of the name Jehovah as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, as well as such often recurring words as Psa. xx, 1, and Isa. li, 1, 2, among

the later, illustrate how firm a hold the past always had on them as a pledge of the future.

But the gist of the promise to the three patriarchs was, that in their seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed; "their seed" being not merely the literal Israel, but also the spiritual which should afterwards be, and foremost of all the personal Messiah—the seed, however, in the sense of the literal Israelitish Church being the providential prerequisite of the seed in the personal Messianic sense. But the Israelites failed to apprehend the full redemptive import of the promise, and hence in their relation to the kingdom of God they wrought to an end which they did not clearly know.

4. *The Blessing of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Gen. xlix, 1-28. Not one of the sons is excluded, as has been the case with Esau and Ishmael. Providential circumstances had united the twelve into one social body. Their interest and hopes were the same, and the union was destined ere long to be made still closer by a common suffering. And perhaps not one was wholly faithless or indifferent in regard to the promise made to the fathers. Even the house of Joseph, which was at one time far removed from his brethren in fortune and position, was brought back, not only by reason of an unswerving faith in the future, but also by the pressure of political circumstances. So the time was at hand for the enlargement of the family into a people. Jacob, the father, was the medium of the prophetic blessing, and by the inclusion of all his sons, the twelve foundation stones were formally laid of the visible kingdom of God.

The words necessarily received their coloring from the

deep impression left upon Jacob by his own long, varied and severe experience. All was well now, but the past abode with him. His three eldest sons are reduced to a subordinate position among their brethren, on account of their wanton and passionate cruelty. His vision rests pathetically on the promised land, from which he, during so many years of his life, had lived in enforced exile. His words are the history of the tribes in miniature, from the entrance and conquest of Canaan to the end of the Israelitish nation.

But while the whole passage is significant in its relation to the development of the kingdom of God the prophecy in regard to Judah was the one most specifically so. He was the lion-like one in war, and led the other tribes in valor; nor should his tribal existence cease until He should come to whom belonged the sceptre, and unto whom the people should yield willing obedience—words which certainly found their fulfillment in the Messiah-King. There is nothing, however, requiring us to believe that Jacob, or any of the tribes saw in the word *Shiloh* a Divine personal Messiah, who afterward came to be called Shiloh. His vision was of a coming One, to whom Sovereignty rightfully belonged, and around whom the people would gather, and to whom they would render glad obedience. To this future Judah might ever look, and the abiding hope of its realization would be only another guaranty of the perpetuity of the kingdom of God.*

*The question as to the right translation of Gen. xlix, 10, has given rise to much discussion, and the answers have been various; but it seems that the idea intended to be conveyed is as above given, and is not antagonistic to our English versions

§3. The Redemptive Calling of Israel.

The Israelites being redeemed from bondage in Egypt, by Jehovah's mighty hand, they cease to be a mere people, and become henceforth a nation. This introduces us to their formal redemptive call to be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.

"Thus shalt thou say to the house of Jacob, and tell the children of Israel: "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself. Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice, indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me from among all peoples, for all the earth is mine; and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." (Ex. xix, 3-6.

1. *The Basis of the Call.* The immediate basis of the call was the covenant of promise made with the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The remoter basis was the Divine purpose, which looked beyond Israel to the redemption of the world. The knowledge of the patriarchal promise still preserved among them, and recently greatly enlivened by the events of the exodus, enabled the Israelites to apprehend with some degree of clearness the immediate end aimed at in the call, but with far less clearness the remoter end to which they were probably to a great extent the unconscious means. It was to them in large part the occasion only of the glorification of themselves, the fuller knowledge being the possession of the Divinely gifted few.

Jehovah's election of Israel was an act of pure love; not, indeed, that he loved Israel alone, but in order that through Israel he might wound the serpent upon

the head, and win all men back to himself. It can be called an act of necessity only in so far as it may be said that God was bound by his very nature to adhere to his promise made to Abraham; but this promise was provoked in the first place by nothing but pure love. God may have foreseen that Israel would prove to be more available to his redemptive purpose than another nation which he might call would be; nevertheless, Israel's election was an act of free grace, for God was under no compulsion, except that of his love, to choose any people to fill the Messianic office which Israel filled.

2. *The Nature and Significance of the Call.*

(a.) Jehovah declared himself in the call to be already the Sovereign of the whole earth, but that he would constitute Israel into a peculiar kingdom, over which he would rule in a special and peculiar manner; the sceptre being the sceptre of absolute sovereignty, it is true, but the sovereignty was to be the sovereignty of love; a kingdom which should stand to him in the relation of bride, and in relation to whom he should be the tender Lover, "spreading the wings of love over the chosen one, but also a strict and jealous Husband, demanding fidelity and love, punishing unfaithfulness and apostacy, requiring a royal heart in the royal bride; seeking by love and discipline to train her will, trying and proving her." (Isa. liv, 5; Jer. xxxi, 2, 3.)

(b.) The nature and significance of the call is further seen in the fact that the relationship into which it brought Israel with Jehovah, is also presented, under the figure of sonship. No other nation was regarded as so related to him. Israel was his first-born son, "brought forth under the anguish of Egyptian bondage, by the

aid of a heavenly midwife." "Thus saith Jehovah, Israel is my son, my first-born." (Ex. iv, 22.) "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." (Hos. xi, 1.) He preferred him for the end in view to other nations, and bestowed upon him the primogeniture, a double portion of his Fatherly care and culture. In due time other sons were to be born, but not yet; in due time other nations were to be incorporated into the kingdom, but for the present Israel is his only one and peculiar favorite.

(c.) Israel was regarded also as the property of Jehovah. The whole earth was his; but they, keeping his covenant and hearkening attentively to his voice, should become to him a choice possession, a treasure peculiarly his own beyond all peoples. On the condition named Israel was to be Jehovah's property, not by virtue of creation only, as were the other nations, but by virtue of their own redemption and of the use which he would make of them in the ultimate redemption of others. Other nations had been created; Israel, only, had as yet been begotten; Israel, only, had he redeemed from foreign slavery to be in a higher sense his own. But Israel was ever to remember that their Jehovah was not limited in his possession to themselves. "The whole earth is mine." He was no mere national God, co-ordinate with the gods of other nations, but the Only One, the Universal One, in respect to whom the gods of other nations were mere nothings. If Israel would not be his own he could choose another. His exclusive and universal sovereignty was the groundwork, not only of Israel's conception of God, but also of his unswerving allegiance to him.

(d.) But Israel was to be not merely peculiarly Jehovah's own. It was to be his people, but with an end in view, which, while it included Israel, looked beyond Israel. Hence the covenant people were to be a kingdom of priests and a holy nation; or, a kingdom and a priesthood combined; a nation all the members of which were priest-kings; a nation educated, disciplined, and set apart by Jehovah to the accomplishment of his redemptive purpose. The priesthood of Israel was not the priesthood of Aaron. It was before Aaron's, and it was perpetual and universal. It was rather after the order of Melchisedee, who represented no family and performed priestly functions for no tribe and no man in particular. As Melchisedee represented the true God in the darkening world about him, so should Israel; as God mediated through Aaron with Israel, so through Israel would he mediate with the world. Israel should come out from the other nations, be apart from them, not merely geographically, but in religion considered both as matters of belief and as matters of cultus, and in the exercise of its priestly functions receive, preserve and communicate to other nations and to future generations God's revelations and promises; for Israel had been constituted the first born in the outset only as a pledge that there should be other sons. But Israel was not merely a priesthood, but also a kingdom, the embodiment on earth of the the redemptive kingdom of which God himself was King. The central idea of both priesthood and kingdom is universal salvation, the latter being the form assumed by the results which the other achieves. As Israel's priesthood implies a prior patriarchal priesthood, so theocracy implies a prior form of the kingdom.

After a while when Israel shall have slowly and reluctantly and blindly fulfilled all its functions as priesthood and kingdom, the form of both will be again changed, but the essence will remain; and when the kingdom of Jehovah shall ultimately have become co-extensive with the Kingdom of Elohim, all enemies being put under his feet, there shall be no longer a priesthood, but only a kingdom.

§ 4. Obligations and Penalties Involved in the Call.

The call of Israel implies the acceptance by Israel of the call, and this in turn implies the acceptance by the covenant people of certain obligations and the risk of certain penalties, should the obligations fail to be met.

1. The obligation upon the covenant people consisted in the duty on their part to conform to the conditions annexed to the covenant. In the case of the Abrahamic call the conditions are recorded in Gen. xvii, 1 ff, xviii, 19:—“walk before me and be thou perfect;” “ye shall be circumcised;” “keep the way of the Jehovah;” “do justice and judgment.” The perfection here required was not sinlessness, but doing justice and judgment, walking without deviation from the line marked out by the will of Jehovah. In the case of Israel the obligation was the same: “If ye will obey my voice,” (Ex. xix, 5): Perfect submission to Jehovah’s will, and faithfulness thereto as expressed in his law, the details of which were about to be given, but the substance of which was, “Be ye holy for I am holy;” be ye apart in all respects from other nations, as I am apart in all respects from other gods; a holiness which was already illustrated in circumcision, and was soon to be illustrated in its fullest import by the whole Mosaic

legislation. To conform to whatever might be the requisitions of this legislation was to be holy, and to be holy was to fulfill the obligations involved in the call. In this sense, therefore, the moral, the ceremonial, and the civil legislation of Moses were of co-ordinate importance. Each was to be regarded as the legislation of Jehovah, and to disobey either branch was to disavow allegiance to him, and hence be no longer apart from other nations. The ground of all alike was the required holiness of the people, and all were alike obligatory until abrogated by the accomplishment of the object aimed at in their institution. Once having subscribed to the terms of the call, or covenant, the people have no alternative but to conform to these conditions or be punished.

2. In the Mosaic period retribution is for obvious reasons mainly restricted to the present life, though this does not imply that the doctrine of punishment in the future state was not one of the beliefs of the people. This silence concerning the future was due to the importance of the present. Israel as a nation was undergoing a process of Divine tuition for a purpose which included not only themselves, but all nations and all times. This tuition might be better accomplished by appealing for the most part to such retribution as might be inflicted in the present life, and hence not only upon the individual Israelite but also upon the nation. The individual was important because the Kingdom of God, as represented in the nation, was important, and this was important because of its mission, or the larger things to which it looked and of which it was both the prophecy and means. The retributive punishments inflicted upon individuals

and families during the early history of the Israelites, and for which no distinct legal provision had been made, as in the case of Abiram, Dathan, Korah and Achan, were due not merely to the turpitude of the sins of which they were guilty as between themselves and Jehovah; but, also, and chiefly to the fact that they were members of a body-politic which was for the time being the Kingdom of God, and which, in order to the fulfillment of its redemptive world-mission, must be made to know speedily and keenly the heinousness of all forms of conduct which stood in the way of that fulfillment. Only by a speedy apocopation of the diseased member could the body be saved from the deadly infection. Such punishment, therefore, in order to be understood aright, and relieved of apparent disproportionate severity must be considered, not so much in their relation to the crime, as in the relation of the crime to their nation and the nation's mission. They were of the nature of military punishments, justified by the importance of the matter at stake. And not one of the least effective ways whereby to instill into the minds of the people an adequate idea of the importance of their national mission, was to inflict deadly punishment upon every individual who interfered seriously with its accomplishment. Nor was it required by equity that the guilty one should know in advance of his crime and its punishment that he came into collision with the nation's mission; for the only way to impart such knowledge was by the object-lesson, punishment.

The expressly and divinely prescribed forms of national punishment were shortening of life, childlessness and diminution of population, scarcity and famine, and captivity among enemies, or in short, the with-

drawal of the divine blessings. The prescription of these punishments served to put the people on their guard and to keep them in the line of their mission, while their actual infliction served to notify them of departures therefrom and to bring them back to loyalty. But in the case of refusal to repent and return, Israel would cease to be the chosen people and the covenant would become nugatory, Jehovah, on his part, being absolved therefrom; unless, instead, there should still be a remnant to whom his holiness required him still to be faithful. For while Jehovah had elected Israel, and was unalterably fixed in his purpose to redeem the world in accordance with his promise, Gen. iii, 15, he had not unconditionally elected Israel to be the medium of this redemption. This view of the matter reconciles the divine election of Israel with the more than twice repeated threat of Jehovah to annihilate Israel as a nation on account of its disobedience, for however true it is that he foresaw that a remnant would always be left to him, it cannot be said that he threatened merely to alarm. Should Israel fail, he could raise up another people through Moses, or Isaiah, or one who might still be faithful, and thereby fulfill his ultimate purpose and also preserve intact his promise to Abraham that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed.

B. THE KINGDOM OF GOD AS ORGANIZED ISRAEL.

§ 1. *The Theocratic Character of the Government of Israel.*

The government of Israel, as organized by Moses under Divine direction, and, indeed, as continued through all the subsequent ages of its history, was a

union of church and state. It was not a state plus a church, but a state-church, or a church-state, a combination of two into one homogeneous body; the state being the church acting in civil capacity and the church being the state acting in religious and ecclesiastical capacity. Hence the government may be regarded as either church or state, according to the particular function under consideration. This form of all others was most in harmony with Israel's world-wide redemptive mission, and most conducive to its fulfillment. Only thus could Jehovah keep himself in personal relation with his people; only thus could he act in their history, instead of merely on it from without. His standpoint must be visible to them in order that he himself might be visible, and he himself must be visible in order that he might not pass out of Israel's mind, the consequence of which would be that Israel would soon become as the heathen. As it was the purpose in view, however, that rendered this form of government the best, it does not follow that it would be any longer the best after the purpose was accomplished.

As a result of this necessary combination of the church and state functions, the historical subject-matter of the Old Testament, not only during the Mosaic period, but subsequently to the end, is largely what we would now call political, the study of Hebrew politics being the study of a great part of the Bible. It is sacred politics, however, because of its inseparable connection with the outward form assumed by the kingdom of God and its intimate bearing upon the Divine purpose and plan of redemption; but it is sacred politics to us only in so far as we study it in this connection.

and with this in view. God is not merely in the Old Testament as a matter of opinion on the part of those who wrote it. He was actually in the history of which the Old Testament is the record; and he was there as he was not in the history of any pagan nation. God was the sovereign of the whole world in a sense, but he was the sovereign of Israel in particular. The Hebrew theology was in harmony with the facts in the case. Practically he was the sovereign of Israel in particular because Israel recognized him to be so; and the relation of Israel to the other nations often brought his sovereignty into relation to them. But they saw him not; his dark, invisible side was toward them, the bright visible side of the pillow of his sovereignty being only toward Israel. He wrought among the heathens, but with a hand they did not see. As the reference of all terrestrial events whatever, directly and immediately to God as their cause, was a fundamental principle of the Hebrew theology, so the direct and immediate reference to his will of all human actions, whether private or official, was a fundamental principle of the Hebrew constitution. All immediate steps in either case were passed over, being neither affirmed nor denied. In regard to all the enactments, or to any one enactment, it was enough to say: "Ye shall observe all these statutes [for] I am Jehovah."

But while God thus brought himself face to face with the Israelites, becoming in a peculiar sense the head of the nation, and so continuing during the subsequent periods of Old Testament history, "it is to be especially noticed that [his] claim to their allegiance is based, not on his power or wisdom, but on his special mercy in being their Saviour from Egyptian bondage.

Because they were made free by him, therefore they became his servants; and the declaration which stands at the opening of the law is: I am the Lord thy God which brought thee out of the land of Egypt." See Ex. xxi, 1; Deut. v, 6; Josh. xxiv, 1-13; 1 Sam. xii, 6-15. Not only, therefore, was it provided in the Mosaic constitution, and recognized in subsequent history, that God should be the absolute legislative, judicial, and military head of the nation as such, but that he should also be the absolute owner of the people; and this fact lies at the basis of the law requiring a ransom to be paid for the first born (Ex. xxx, 11-16). It was a perpetual object-lesson, serving to remind the people that they were not their own, and thus protecting their allegiance to Jehovah. So also is to be explained the law distinguishing between the Hebrew and the foreign slave. (Lev. xxv, 39-46); the title of one Hebrew in another as his slave could not be absolute, but only limited, as all Hebrews were already the property of Jehovah. The land laws were similarly restrictive, and for the same reason. The title of everything was vested absolutely in Jehovah. The whole net-work of legislation, indeed, provided thoroughly against forgetfulness on the part of the people that Jehovah was not only their God, but was also their absolute King; a being not only to be worshipped by them in their individual and organized capacity, but also one to be obeyed and served both in private and in governmental matters.

He was the avowed and recognized King of Israel, but his special rulership over other nations was withdrawn because it was not recognized; and in the Old Testament he is called king of all nations only in a

general sense, or with reference to the future time when all the kingdoms of the earth should cease to be mere kingdoms of the earth, and become incorporated into the kingdom of God and his Son, and there should be no more a distinction between history sacred and history profane.

§ 2. *The Mosaic Constitutional Law.*

1. The political-religious constitution of the Israelitish commonwealth was founded, as we have seen, upon a religious basis; its fundamental principles being the absolute sovereignty of Jehovah over both the individual and the state, and the required holiness of the people even as Jehovah himself was holy. Everything in the political make-up of the commonwealth looked to the recognition and enforcement of these principles. Even the legislation, which may seem to have been purely sanitary, was not designed to end merely in the prevention or removal of disease. The state was nothing if not religious, and the religion must be of the prescribed type. The religious element could no more be eliminated from the Israelitish constitution, than could the judicial, legislative, or executive, from our system of government. But the principle was recognized, not exactly that the people existed for the government, but rather that the government existed for the people, and the people for a purpose which begun in themselves and which should end in the bringing of all mankind into the kingdom of God. This principle was an essential element even of the Mosaic constitution, and continued so to be to the end of the national history, though the people did not at any time clearly apprehended it, and oftentimes seemed

totally to misapprehend it; as did even David when he sought to number the people for the purpose of waging a selfish, and not a theocratic war; as did also Jonah the prophet, perhaps, when he refused to go on an evangelical mission to Nineveh.

Therefore, the central thought of the whole Mosaic system was one which pertained to the people as such rather than to the government as such: "Thou shalt love Jehovah, thy God," etc., "and thy neighbor as thyself," which of course implied the recognition of Jehovah alone as God. This central principle whereby the allegiance and conduct of the people was to be controlled, was expanded on the two tables of stone into the Ten Words, or Ten Commandments, which thus became at the very outset of the national existence a part of the fundamental law. The enactments of the two tables, respectively, were equally binding, idolatry being treason, and an attempt to introduce idolatry being sedition, and both being punishable, as was murder, with death.

2. But in addition to special fundamental laws, an organism was provided whereby that which would otherwise have been a mere collection of people was transformed into a nation. The same origin, the same suffering, the same religion, and the same land, were essential to the national unity, but were not of themselves sufficient for its procurement and preservation. There must be one central place of worship, common to all the people alike, and one official, with his assistants, to serve all and represent all in the details of the worship; and the laws thus providing for the unity of the people and their national perpetuity, are to be regarded as a part of the fundamental or constitutional

law. But many things in the constitution of the government would evidently remain as they had been prior to the time of Moses. The division of the people had been, and continued to be, into tribes; these into clans or associated families, and these again into families or households. Each tribe had its tribal head or prince, as also each clan and household its head.

In addition to the Tabernacle and Priesthood, there was a visible bond of union and head of all, who, however, was merely Jehovah's representative, or servant, appointed by him to administer the affairs of the government and execute the laws which Jehovah himself had given. He was assisted by a corps of subordinates, called elders, a general term used to designate also the princes of the tribes and the heads of clans. Special judges also were appointed over tens, fifties, hundreds, and thousands. The fundamental law also provided for a sort of legislative assembly, which should meet irregularly, according to particular exigencies. The members as such were not elected, the assembly of any given neighborhood or city being composed of already elected or hereditary elders of the same neighborhood or city. All the elders of a tribe composed the general assembly of that tribe, and all the elders of the several tribes, when convened, composed the general assembly of the whole nation. (Deut. xix, 12; xx, 8, 9; Josh. xxiii, 1, 2, xxiv). The only hereditary office at first seems to have been the priesthood, unless, indeed, we may infer that the tribal and sub-tribal heads were such. But if so it was due to what we may call the previously existing common law, rather than to explicit legislation at the time the government was organized. These hereditary priests

were members, ex-officio, of the general assembly. No provision was made in the constitution for a successor of Moses, Joshua having received his appointment through him directly from Jehovah; Moses' own sons being left to obscurity, to which the unswerving patriot and servant of God and his people submitted without a recorded murmur.

3. The government as organized by Moses was possessed of a judicial system simple in its structure, but elaborate in its extent. The total number of judges, or magistrates of different grades, amounted to many thousands. According to the first census (Num. i, 45), the total number of judges of tens, hundreds, and thousands, would be 66,993. The settlement in Canaan being effected, these magistrates would be distributed throughout all the cities, villages, and rural neighborhoods. By these all minor causes were tried, the weightier causes and appeals being carried to the supreme judge or ruler of the commonwealth; and in case of a failure here, to the high priest. Distinctions between questions of law and questions of fact do not seem to have been drawn with nicety in the days of Moses; and owing to the theocratic nature of the government, and the consequent moral end to which the entire legislation looked, distinctions between ecclesiastical, civil, and criminal causes were also inapplicable. The same court had cognizance alike of all causes. The sentence, or judgment, of the final court had to be accepted under pain of death. (Deut. xvii, 8-13). At least two witnesses were required in all capital matters (Numb. xxxv, 30; Deut. xvii, 6, 7). Punishment was required to be personal, and not to include the family of the guilty (Deut. xxiv, 16), in

which respect the Mosaic jurisprudence differed from that of other Oriental nations (*Esth.* ix, 13, 14). The one who ate the sour grapes should have his own, and not another's, teeth set on edge. (*Jer.* xxxi, 29, 30; *Ezek.* xviii, 20).

4. The course of judicial procedure was simple, and briefly as follows: In Egypt, whence the Israelites had come, the accusing party committed the charge to writing, the accused party replied in writing, the accuser repeated the charge, and the accused replied again, etc. In the Mosaic code, however, the procedure is less formal, and more summary. Hence the complaint is brought before the judge by word of mouth, either by the accuser himself, or by others bringing both parties in the cause into court. (*Deut.* xxi, 20; xxii, 16, xxv, 1). If the accused person did not voluntarily appear he was sent for by the court. It can only be inferred, however, from *Deut.* xxv, 8, that this was the case in all causes. The accusing party, or plaintiff, was called technically the **SATAN**, or the **ADVERSARY**. The judge, or judges, were seated with their legs crossed upon the floor, which was furnished for their accommodation with a carpet and cushions. Both the parties to the suit, or trial, stood up, the accuser to the right of the accused, the latter appearing in later times, at least, in garments of mourning and with disheveled hair. It is not certain that the court in the Mosaic times employed a clerk; subsequently, at least, one was provided who made a complete record of the judicial proceedings.

In some instances, in which the nature of the case rendered it possible, the simple exhibition in court of the article in legislation was regarded as evidence.

(Ex. xxii, 12, 13; Deut. xxii, 15). The complaint in court of a parent against his son for disobedience was regarded as proof, no other being required. (Deut. xxi, 18-21). In general, however, the testimony of at least two witnesses was required, or three, including the testimony of the accuser. The witnesses were put upon their oath, being solemnly adjured to tell the truth. (Lev. v, 1.) The witnesses were examined separately, but the person accused had the privilege of being present when their testimony was taken. (Num. xxxv, 30; Deut. xvii, 1-15). Sometimes the sacred lot was resorted to for the purpose of determining the point in dispute, an instance of which we find in Josh. vii, 14-24. Torture was not resorted to in the earliest period of the national history as a means of evidence, or for extorting a confession of guilt. In later times, however, the custom of applying torture for this purpose was borrowed from the Greeks. Jails or prisons were not used as places of detention, either before trial or after trial, though they were used as places of confinement by way of punishment after sentence was pronounced. As a rule the punishment was inflicted immediately. (Num. xv, 36; Deut. xxii, 18).

§ 3. *The Mosaic Civil Code.*

1. *Concerning parents and children.* The type of the relation existing between parents and children was the relation between Jehovah and his people. As the one was, so was the other to be regarded. The core of the Mosaic constitution being the theocratic principle, he who exercised authority at all exercised it by a Divine right. So with the parent, the father especially, the mother, however, being also expressly mentioned

in the law. (Ex. xx, 12). Offences of children against parents were punishable in the same manner as the same offences against God. The absolute power of life and death, however, was vested not in the father, but in the magistrates of his district or city, though the formal accusation of the parents was sufficient, without further investigation or inquiry, to secure the capital punishment of the child. (Deut. xxi, 18–21). But the irresponsible and extreme power of life and death, conceded by the Roman and other heathen laws was withheld from the Israelite father. The authority of the parent was further restrained by the constant recognition of the fact, symbolized in circumcision and the law requiring the redemption of the first born, that his children were primarily not his own, but Jehovah's. (Numb. xviii, 16; Ex. xiii, 15).

But while the authority of the parents, and the love and service due to them from the children, and even from the grand children, are recognized in the most prominent and emphatic manner, the welfare and interest of the children are also protected by the law. The parents were required to educate their children in all matters pertaining to the civil and religious polity. (Deut. iv, 9; vi, 6 ff.) A law was enacted (Deut. xxi, 15–17), forbidding parental partiality from ignoring the common law right of primogeniture. On the father's death the first-born son became the head of the family, and his authority over it was similar to that possessed by the father, though this was also a matter of the common law which the Mosaic legislation merely recognized. (1 Sam. xx, 29). The power of the father over the daughter ceased at her marriage and passed to her husband. If an unmarried daughter

should make a vow the father could not disannul it, unless he did so on the day when it was made. (Num. xxx, 3-5). There is no sufficient reason for believing that the daughter became in any sense “of age” at twelve years, as modern Jewish authorities teach.

2. *Marriage laws.* The object of the Mosaic legislation was not to interfere radically with what we may call the existing common law regarding marriage, but only to add such enactments as would mitigate rather than entirely remove existing evils.

As the power of the father over the daughter before marriage was practically absolute, so was the power of the husband after marriage. Only two classes of women may be said to have possessed an independent legal existence; the woman who had married and thus been freed from the will of her father, and had been divorced and thus freed from the will of her husband; the other was the heiress, or only child of her deceased parents. The married woman could never enter independently into any engagement, even before God. (Num. xxx, 6-15). In harmony with the benevolent intention of the Mosaic legislation, betrothal was regarded as virtually equivalent to marriage; and faithlessness on the part of a betrothed virgin was punishable with death, as was also the betrayer. The husband, in this case, however, might instead of the punishment of death, put the woman to whom he was betrothed away by a bill of divorce, but in the event the accusation against her proved to be false, the husband forever thereafter forfeited the right of divorce, (Deut. xxii, 23, 24; xxiv, 1), and was required also to pay a fine. (Deut. xxii, 13-21).

Moses, however, neither instituted nor forbade divorce, but only suffered it, regarding it as a contravention, both of the law of nature and of God. He was legislating under Divine guidance primarily for his own times and his own people, and since he could not extirpate at a blow an evil which was traditional and common, he sought to hedge about the evil by restrictive legislation, and thus prepare the public mind for its complete abolition. He provided that divorce should hereafter be under the restraint of legal process, and not as heretofore at the arbitrary will and pleasure of the husband. He also enacted that the divorced wife who married a second time should stand to her former husband in the relation of an adulteress; and he could not under any circumstances remarry her. In order to further endear the marriage tie, and prevent its frivolous rupture, it was also enacted that if one married his slave, whether one bought or captured in war, she ceased thereupon to be his actual property; she could no longer be sold, and if ill-treated she was to be declared free and at liberty to go whithersoever she would. (Ex. xxi, 7-9; Deut. xxi, 10-14).

The law relating to levirate marriage is found in Deut. xxv, 5-10. The custom existed before the time of Moses (Gen. xxxviii), and was not peculiar to the Hebrews. Moses recognized the common law on this subject in his legislation and introduced various wise and politic limitations of its rigor. The duty of marrying the deceased brother's or kinsman's widow was recognized merely as one of affection to the memory of the deceased, and could not be enforced by law.

For the Mosaic table of prohibited marriages see Lev. xviii, the remarkable nature and excellence of

which can only be duly appreciated by contrasting it with the abominations and irregularities in the usages even of the most cultivated nations of antiquity. Here Moses antagonized also the common law of the Hebrews. The Mosaic law also expressly prohibited marriage with the Canaanites, a law which, however, was not observed with the greatest strictness. (Ex. xxxiv, 16; Deut. vii, 3, 4; Jud. iii, 6, 7).

The attitude of the legislation in regard to polygamy can be regarded only as one of toleration, and not of sanction. To have positively prohibited it would have put the legislator in conflict with his people in respect to an ancient custom, and any positively prohibitory legislation would have been virtually a dead letter. Polygamy, however, besides being sanctioned by ancient common law, may have been for the time being the least of two or more evils which would necessarily have taken its place had any decided attempt been made to abolish it. But the spirit of Mosaism was against it, recognizing only the marriage of one man to one woman as the ideal marriage, and which would gradually lead to such a change of public sentiment as to bring about the voluntary abandonment of polygamy.

3 Concerning master and slave. In slavery also the legislator found an institution of long and general standing, and which could not be abolished without also abolishing the prevalent type of civilization. This latter he could not do, for the very nature of the Divine purpose in regard to Israel and the world required that it should be wrought out by a process and not by a stupendous miracle. The best, therefore, which the legislator could do was to enact laws which would mit-

igate the evils of slavery, and gradually prepare for and lead to its total abolition.

In the Mosaic code, indeed, we find the very earliest trace of legislative protection of the slave; slight it may be, but contrasting favorably with the cruelty of ancient practice. All Hebrew bondmen it seems were treated, in regard to life and limb, like freemen, but the master was permitted by the law to retain the right to chastise his foreign slave with a rod; but under such restraint as to incur such punishment as the judges might impose if the chastised slave died under his hand. (Ex. xxi, 20; compare verse 12). And when a master inflicted a permanent injury on the person of his bond-servant, he was required to give him his absolute freedom as an equivalent for the lost member. (Ex. xxi, 26, 27).

The servitude of Hebrew slaves who had become such, either in consequence of debt (Lev. xxv, 39), or of the commission of theft (Ex. xxii, 3), could not be enforced by law for a longer period than six full years, and at the expiration of that time the liberated bondman could not be sent away without a liberal supply of provisions. His wife and children became free with him only if they came to his master with him. (Ex. xxi, 1-6; Deut. xv, 12-18). A slave might voluntarily condemn himself to perpetual bondage by the formula of having his ears bored; though it is not certain that he also was not liberated at the Jubilee. (Lev. xxv, 10, 11).

A slave sold to a resident foreigner might be redeemed by his kinsman at a price proportional to the distance from the Jubilee. (Lev. xxv, 47-54). Foreigners who became slaves to Hebrews were to be

held and inherited as property, and fugitive slaves from foreign nations could not be given up. (Lev. xxv, 45, 46; Deut. xxiii, 15).

4. *Concerning foreigners.* Four terms are used to describe them. The *ger*, designated the foreigner who resided temporarily among the Israelites; the *toshab*, the one who resided permanently among them; the *ezrah*, a foreigner born among the Israelites; and the *goyim*, the nations generally, who held no relationship with the Israelites. The Mosaic enactments in regard to foreigners, or strangers, have reference to those who resided in the land among the Israelites, the number of whom was doubtless always large. (2 Chr. ii, 17). The laws regulating the political, social, and ecclesiastical status of the resident foreigner were characterized by a spirit of great liberality, (Ex. xxii, 21; Deut. x, 19), being based upon the fact that the Israelites themselves were once strangers in Egypt.

Foreigners of all nationalities, including even the Canaanites, might, under certain conditions, be admitted to the rights of citizenship, except the Moabites and Ammonite (Deut. xxiii, 3); and with these exceptions they seem to have been eligible to all civil offices except that of king; (Deut. xvii, 15), though the later Jews excluded them from all. The resident foreigner was absolutely amenable to all the laws of the commonwealth. A foreigner who was a bondman was required to be circumcised (Ex. xii, 44); nor could a free foreigner partake of the Passover, and be regarded as a full citizen unless he submitted to the same rite. Circumcision made him an Israelite. (Ex. xii, 48).

5. *Concerning land and other property.* The Israel-

itish land holder was regarded in the law only as the tenant of Jehovah, and could not sell his land in perpetuity. (Lev. xxv, 23). All land returned at the Jubilee to its original owner, and its market price was required to vary according to the length of time between the sale and the year of Jubilee. (Lev. xxv, 25-27). If a man should sell a dwelling house he was allowed by law the privilege of redeeming it in a year; if he did not redeem it in that time it was to be regarded as a sale in perpetuity, the houses of the Levites, however, being redeemable at any time. (Lev. xxv, 29-34).

Land, houses, and other property, except clean animals, devoted by vow to Jehovah, might be redeemed by the owner by paying one-fifth more for it than the priest's estimated valuation. (Lev. xxvii). A man's property, on his death, descended by law to his sons, and in default of these, to his daughters, who in this case were required to marry in their own tribe. (Num. xxxvi, 6-9). If there were also no daughters, the property went to the brothers of the deceased, and if there were no brothers to the uncles of the deceased on the father's side, and lastly to the next of kin generally.

The eldest son of the deceased received a double portion. (Num. xxvii, 9-11; Deut. xxi, 17). In the case of a widow who did not marry a second time and died without children, the property reverted to her next of kin. The Mosaic law required a strict entail of land, testamentary dispositions being therefore superfluous. The Israelites, indeed, knew nothing about wills. If an heiress married, her property did not vest in her husband, but devolved upon her son, who took the name, not of his father, but of his mother's father.

6. *Laws concerning debts, interest, etc.* Bankers and sureties in the commercial sense are unknown in the Mosaic law. There was no statute of limitation, though no claim against an Israelite could be collected during the Sabbatical year. Interest on loans was forbidden, though pledges of payment might be taken. The outer garment, if taken as a pledge, was required to be returned before sunset; the widow's garment and the family millstones could not be taken as pledges; the creditor was forbidden to enter the house of the one to whom he had loaned to claim his pledge, but should remain outside until the borrower brought it to him. (Deut. xv, xxiv). These laws were for the purpose of protecting the poor against extortion and oppression. Unfortunately they were to a great extent annulled by the traditions of the elders, and the kingdom of God as represented in the later Jewish theocracy ceased to be characterized by the spirit which was incorporated into its earliest code.

7. *Tax laws.* The only regularly recurring taxes required by the original law of the theocracy were the Tithes, the First Fruits, and the Redemption money of the first born. The tithe tax was not instituted by Moses, but was only regulated by him, and accommodated to the new order of things which he introduced. It consisted of a tenth of all the produce of the land and of cattle, and was of the nature of an ecclesiastical tax, payable annually, for the support of the Levites, who in turn paid a tenth of this for the support of the priests. Beyond this no provision was made for the payment of salaries.

A second tithe was payable every third year, but whether it was a tenth of all or only of the nine-tenths

remaining from the first tithe, is not certain. This was expended in a great triennial feast of rejoicing in which all the people, including the Levites, joined, and which was intended to keep alive a sense of gratitude to God. If a man wished to redeem any of this tithe he might do so by paying its value plus a fifth in money. (*Lev. xxvii; Numb. xviii; Deut. xiv.*)

The law also required each head of family to offer the first fruits of the vine, fruit trees, grain, honey, wool, etc., as an expression of the gratitude which was due to God for the country which he had given them. (*Ex. xviii, 19; Num. xv, 17-21; xviii, 11-13.*) These became the property of the priests. The second first fruits of *Deut. xxvi, 1-11* were appropriated to the eucharistic sacrifices, and were consumed in the feasts which were made from them. When the basket of this second first fruit was brought to the Tabernacle, or Temple, the bringer was required to set it down before the altar and return thanks in a loud voice to God who had given to him and his fellow-countryman such a rich inheritance. The quantity of first-fruits thus required as tax was not specified in the law, only the minimum, one-sixtieth being stated.

The Redemption money was derived thus: The first born, both of men and animals, were required by the law to be consecrated to God; the first born children were required by the law to be presented to a priest, and redeemed by the payment of a sum mentioned by the priest, but which could not exceed five shekels (*Num. xviii, 14-16.*) The first born sons were by birth priests, and were to be thus redeemed from serving as such. (*Num. iii, 2 of.*) The first born of cattle, goats, and sheep, from eight days to a year old,

were to be offered in sacrifice, and the parts designated being burnt, the remainder belonged to the priests. (Num. xxiii, 17, 18; Lev. xxvii, 26). The first born of such animals as could not be offered in sacrifice were to be redeemed by a lamb or kid; or if not redeemed its neck was to be broken, or it was to be valued by the priest and a sum paid for its redemption. (Lev. xxvii, 11-13). It was intended by these laws to keep the Israelites mindful of the preservation of their first born in Egypt. The various provisions for the poor may also be regarded as of the nature of tax laws. (Deut. xxiii, 24, 25; xxiv, 19-22; Lev. xix, 9, 10).

§ 4. *The Criminal Code.*

1. All forms of idolatry, acknowledgement of any god but Jehovah, witchcraft, false prophecy, blasphemy, and Sabbath-breaking were regarded as treason, inasmuch as they were calculated to undermine the allegiance of the people to their only king, Jehovah, and were punishable with death by stoning. This construction of such crimes was demanded by the theocratic nature of the government as the visible kingdom of God; and especially was it demanded at a time when even the covenant people were far from being rigid believers in the doctrine of monotheism. (See Ex. xxii, 18-20; Lev. xix, 31; xxi, 1-5; xxiv, 15, 16; Num. xv, 32-36; Deut. xiii, xvii, 2-5; xviii, 9-22).

2. The following other offenses are also mentioned in the law as being punishable with death. Disobedience to parents. (Ex. xxii, 15, 17). Adultery (Lev. xx, 10, etc). Unchastity before marriage, but detected afterward (Deut. xxii, 21). Unchastity of a betrothed woman with one not affianced to her.

Deut. xxii, 23). Unchastity of a priest's daughter (Lev. xxi, 9). Rape of a married woman (Deut. xxii, 25). Incestuous and unnatural connections (Lev. xx, 11-16). Kidnapping (Deut. xxiv, 7). False witness, in cases where the person accused would be liable to capital punishment (Deut. xix, 16, 19). Eating sacrifices in an unclean condition (Lev. xxii, 3, 4, 9). Touching holy things illegally (Num. iv, 15, 18, 20). Murder, without reprieve (Deut. xxi, 18-21). Death by negligence (Ex. xxi, 28-30).

3. The following offenses were punishable by exclusion as one of the covenant people and hence from the rights of citizenship*: Neglect of Passover (Num. ix, 13); neglect of Atonement day (Lev. xxiii, 29); work done on atonement day. (Lev. xxiii, 30); anointing a stranger, or one not of the family of Aaron, with the holy oil (Lev. xxx, 33); unauthorized com-

*In regard to the meaning of the phrase "cut off" in the passages above referred to there is considerable diversity of opinion among scholars. Michaelis, speaking of the import of Num. xv, 30, says: "This passage the apostle Paul appears to have understood in reference to the punishment of death, and such seems to have been its traditional exposition in the Jewish law, from his presupposing it as well known, that whoever was guilty of a deliberate breach of the ceremonial law of Moses must die without mercy." Michaelis thinks, however, that in some cases "cutting off" may have meant simply deprivation of civil rites and exile (*Com. on the Laws of Moses. Art.* 237). Jahn says: "The more recent Jewish interpreters have understood by excision from the people, excommunication; and have accordingly made three species of it. I. Excommunication in the slightest degree was separation from the synagogue, and the suspension of intercourse with all Jews, even with one's wife and domestics. A person who had exposed himself to excommunication of this sort was not allowed to approach another nearer than a distance of four cubits. This separation was continued for a period of thirty days; and in case the excommunicated person

pounding of the holy oil; eating leavened bread during the Passover (Ex. xii, 15, 19); eating fat of sacrifices (Lev. vii, 25); eating blood (Lev. vii, 27; viii, 14); eating the sacrifice of peace-offering on third day or later (Lev. xix, 5-8); making the holy incense for private use as a perfume (Ex. xxx, 38); neglect of purification (Num. xix, 13, 20); neglecting to bring offering to door of Tabernacle after slaying a beast for food. (Lev. xvii, 4, 9). As a rule the expression "to be cut off" most probably means to be declared an outlaw, or excluded from all part in the covenant. It was sometimes accompanied with the sentence of death.

4. Other crimes were punished variously as follows: (1.) In the case of accidental homicide the guilty person might escape the avenger of blood by flight to a city of refuge, residing there till the death of the high priest (Num. xxxv, 9-28). (2). Uncertain murder was required to be expiated by the sus-

did not repent, the time might be doubled or tripled, even when the transgression by means of which it was incurred was of small consequence. II. The second degree of excommunication is denominated *cherem, the curse*, and was more severe in its effects than that just mentioned. It was pronounced with imprecations, in the presence of ten men and so thoroughly excluded the guilty person from all communication with his countrymen, that they were not allowed to sell him anything, even the necessities of life. III. The third degree of excommunication, which was more severe in its consequences than either of the preceding was denominated *shamata*. It was a solemn and absolute exclusion from all intercourse and communion with any other individuals of the nation, and the criminal was left in the hands and to the justice of God." Jahn also says that when God is introduced as saying: "I will cut him off from the people," the expression means some event in Divine Providence which shall eventually terminate that person's family; but if the expression, "He shall be cut off from the people," be used, the punishment of stoning is meant. (*Archæology*, § 258).

pected person by a formal disavowal and sacrifice (Deut. xxi, 1-9). (3). Assault was punishable by lex talionis, or damages (Ex. xxi, 18, 19, 22-25; Lev. xxiv, 19, 20). (4). Seduction of betrothed virgin was to be compensated by marriage, and fine of fifty shekels, and without right of divorce; if the maiden's father refused to marry his daughter to the man the latter was required to pay a heavy fine. (Ex. xxii, 16, 17; Deut. xxii, 29). (5). Theft was punishable by requirement of double or four-fold restitution; a nocturnal robber might be slain (Ex. xxii, 1-4); if the thief was unable to make restitution he was to be sold as a slave. (6). For trespass and injury of things lent a fair compensation was required to be made. (Ex. xxii, 5-15). (7). False testimony was punishable by lex talionis (Ex. xxiii, 1-3; Deut. xix, 16-21). (8). Slander of a wife's chastity subjected the husband to a fine of a hundred shekels, and chastisement not exceeding forty stripes, and loss of right of divorce (Deut. xxii 17-19).

§ 5. *The Ceremonial Law.*

The centre of Israelitish worship, as prescribed by Moses, was the Tabernacle. Its ministers were the High Priest, the Priests, and the Levites. Its ceremonies consisted of the various altar offerings, the observance of certain feasts and festivals, purifications, and certain prescribed ceremonies in connection with vows.

1. The Tabernacle was necessary in order to give unity and coherency to the public worship; and public worship was necessary in order that there might be private worship and a corresponding morality. It was also a perpetual object lesson keeping the people mind-

ful of certain fundamental truths of their religion. Moses was acquainted with the splendid temples of the Egyptians, but owing to the unsettled condition of the Israelites, the center of worship which he, under Divine guidance, had constructed for his people, was necessarily of a portable and more diminutive character. The Tabernacle proper was an oblong square, thirty cubits long from west to east and ten broad from north to south, this being the position in which it was always required to be placed. This enclosure was divided into two parts by a vail, separating the Holy Place from the Holy of Holies. The latter was ten cubits square, and contained the ark in which were placed the two tables of the law, Aaron's rod, and the pot of manna. The top of the ark was the "mercy seat," called *kapporeth* in Hebrew which means a *covering*; on this the blood of the yearly atonement was sprinkled by the high priest, whereby the sins of the people were covered or concealed from the Divine eye. He looked on the atoning or covering blood, and not on the sins. Over the ark at the two extremities were two cherubim with their faces turned toward each other, and perhaps inclined somewhat toward the mercy seat. The Holy Place contained the golden candlestick which was placed at the end next to the vail, and the table of show bread on the right, and the altar of incense on the left, the entrance being at the eastern end. The laver was outside between the altar of burnt-offering and the entrance, the whole being surrounded by a curtain wall five cubits high, one hundred long, and fifty broad. The enclosure between this and the Tabernacle was called the court.

2. The Priests and Levites were the ministers of the Tabernacle. All the people had been called by Jehovah, and separated from other nations to a holy service. They were a nation of royal priests. But practically all could not serve as priests in the sense in which Aaron and his helpers did. The tribe of Levi was therefore chosen, but not for the purpose of totally depriving the people as a whole of their priestly character; for their world-redemptive mission rendered this priestly character inalienable. The tribe of Levi was chosen for special service as a reward, it seems, of their devotion on the occasion when the other Israelites worshipped the golden calf. Their general function was to minister before Jehovah in his courts. Out of this tribe the family of Amram was chosen to perform the functions of the priesthood, which devolved in the first place upon Aaron as the head of that house, he being the high priest and his two sons Ithamar and Eleazar the priests. The oldest living son of the high priests succeeded to that office on his father's death. In the formula of consecration the high priest alone was anointed, and hence he alone bore the distinctive title of "the anointed priest," the oil being poured both upon his head and also upon his garments. (Lev. viii, 7-12; 22-29; Psa. cxxx, 2). The anointing of the common priest, was confined, it seems, to sprinkling their garments with the anointing oil. The distinction, however, between the anointings is not clear. (See Lev. iv, 3, 5, 16; vi, 15; Ex. xxviii, 41).

The official attire of the high priest consisted of eight parts. (1) *The breastplate*, in which were fastened the twelve precious stones in four rows. These stones were probably the Urim and Thurnim. (2).

The ephod with its curious girdle. (3). *The blue robe* of the ephod. (4). *The mitre*, or uper turban, bearing the inscription, "Holiness to the Lord." (5), *The girdle*. (6). *The broidered coat*, or tunic, the material, as in the case of the girdle, being gold, blue, red, crimson, and fine white linen. (7). *The breeches* of linen covering the loins and thighs. (8). *The bonnet*, or turban, of linen. The four last were common to all priests.

The fixed and invariable functions of the priests were: (1). To watch over the fire on the altar of burnt-offering and prevent it from ever becoming extinguished. (Lev. vi, 12). (2). To fill the golden candlestick, or lamp, with oil (Lev. xxiv, 2). (3). To offer the morning and evening sacrifices on the altar of burnt-offering, each being accompanied with a meat-offering and a drink-offering. (Ex. xxix, 38-44). (4). A priest was required always to be at hand to do the prescribed service for any guilty, or penitent, or rejoicing, Israelite. (Lev. i, 5, 15; ii, 2, 9; iii, 14; xii, 6; xiii, xiv, xv; Num. vi, 1-21). (5). To pronounce the special formula of benediction on the people at the great solemn assemblies. (Num. vi, 22-27). (6). To serve, ex officio, as civil judges, and in some respects as public teachers. (Lev. x, 11; Deut. xxviii, 10). (7). The duty peculiar to the high priest was that of entering the Holy of Holies on one day in the year, the great day of atonement, for the purpose of sprinkling the blood of the sin-offering on the mercy-seat and burning incense within the vail.

The Hebrew priests, as was the custom generally among ancient nations, performed their sacred services with naked feet, as a symbol of reverence and venera-

tion. The custom is still in vogue in the East. The Hebrew priests were also required to be without bodily blemish, and according to the original law their services were limited by the ages of thirty and fifty.

3. *Offerings.* The ordinary sacrifices were (1) The daily burnt-offering, the Sabbath burnt-offering (the daily doubled), the burnt-offerings at the festivals, at the consecration of priests, the purification of women, the removal of leprosy or other ceremonial uncleanness, and the votive burnt-offering. (Ex. xxix, 38-42; Lev. i, vii, ix, xii, xiii, xiv, xxiii); also the free-will burnt-offering, which, however, was not required by law, but was brought on occasions of special solemnity. (Num. vii). (2). The meat-offering and drink-offering of flour, oil, frankincense, free from all leaven and seasoned with salt. (Lev. ii, vi, 14-23). (3). The peace-offering of the herd of the flock which might be either eucharistic, votive, or free-will. (Lev. iii, vii, 11-21). (4). The sin-offering and trespass-offering, (Lev. iv, v, vi). Sin-offerings seem to have been made for the priests, the congregation, and individuals; trespass-offerings, for individuals only, and for special sins committed through ignorance of a law which should have been known.

4. Laws intended to implant and develop the idea of holiness.

(1) Laws requiring and regulating the dedication of first born and first fruit. (Ex. xxii, 29-30; Deut. xxvi, etc.)

(2) Distinction between clean and unclean food. (Lev. xi; Deut. xiv. etc.)

(3) Concerning purifications. (Lev. xii-xv; Deut. xxiii, 1-14).

-
- (4) Laws against disfigurement. (Lev. xix, 27; Deut. xiv, 1, etc.)
 - (5) Against unnatural marriages and lusts. Lev. xviii; xx.)
 - (6) Concerning the consecration of the priests. (Lev. viii; ix.)
 - (7) Special qualifications and restrictions of priests. Lev. xxi; xxii, 1-9.)
 - (8) Rights and authority of priests. (Deut. xvii, 8-13; xviii, 1-6.)
 - (9) Concerning the weekly Sabbath. (Ex. xx, 9-11, etc.).
 - (10) The Sabbatical year. (Ex. xxiii, 10, 11, etc.)
 - (11) The year of jubilee. (Lev. xxv, 8-16, etc.)
 - (12) Concerning the Passover. (Lev. xxiii, 4-14, etc.)
 - (14) The Feast of Tabernacles. (Lev. xxiii, 33-43).
 - (15) The Feast of Trumpets. (Lev. xxiii, 23, 25, etc.)
 - (16) The Day of Atonement. (Lev. xxiii, 26-32, etc.)
-

C. THE TYPICAL AND PROPHETICAL ASPECTS OF THE KINGDOM.

§ 1. *The Mosaic “Types.”*

The Mosaic sacrifices and ritual had an anticipative significance. It was the intention of their Divine Author that they should look forward to the Christ of the New Testament. There would have been no Mosaic ritual had it not been the divine intention that

there should be in the fullness of time a corresponding gospel. As were Aaron and his functions in the Mosaic system, so were Christ and his functions in the gospel system. So with other details. Consequently, when the gospel system comes into vogue, the Mosaic system becomes thereby annulled, and is of no further use, except as an ancient pattern whereby to test the accuracy of statements concerning gospel facts. The great sacrifice of the Cross is to be interpreted in the light of that significance which it was intended that the ancient Israelite should find in the Mosaic ritual, and not the latter in the light of the former. He who uses his knowledge of the gospel system for the purpose of tracing minute resemblances between it and the various details of the Mosaic system in reversing the process, and indulging an arbitrary and fanciful *eisegesis* which inserts its desired teaching into the text. The tracing of real analogies between the Mosaic and Christian system is worthy of the name of exegesis, but the *vice versa* process is not. The sun is not needed to illuminate a candle; but the candle is needed for its own purpose before the sun rises. And to test the accuracy of our vision of an object, it may be necessary to compare it with our vision of it in the light of the candle while it was yet night. Or, to change the figure, a machine may sometimes be best studied in its diminutive model, but if the model must needs be understood by means of the machine, then we have no use for the model.

In this sense the Mosaic institutes may be regarded as typical to us. But they were not typical to the contemporary Israelites, for whose benefit they were immediately designed. It is incumbent upon Biblical

Theology to discuss these institutes only in their relation to the Israelites themselves, while the systematic theologian may use them in their anticipative force for the purpose of ascertaining the corresponding parts of the New Testament system. The Israelites as a people probably at no period of their national history saw with accuracy of vision a well-defined and fully-developed personal Christ, and a fully-developed christological system, typified in the Mosaic ceremonial institutes. Nor does it seem necessary or intended that they should. It requires an eye of considerable culture to see the oak tree in the acorn; and the acorn may have a present value of its own, apart from the coming oak. The Israelite, by virtue of his descent from Abraham through Isaac and Jacob, was a member of the theocracy, or visible kingdom of God, but he attained to salvation in the spiritual and individual sense only by reason of his faith in the divine redemptive purpose, just as a contemporary Gentile might thus be saved even though he had no membership in the theocracy. Beyond this purpose of redemption the average Isrelite, especially, could scarcely have seen the historical particulars of the New Testament system in his ritual. What he did see, however, was truly a gospel, though the personal Christ through whom redemption was being wrought was most probably to a great extent invisible. To the average Israelite Aaron terminated in himself; so did the sacrificial victim; so did every detail of the system terminate in itself, so far as the Israelite was concerned. Abraham saw Christ's day, as did others of keener vision than the average. But neither in the ritual, nor the priesthood, nor beyond, did the Israelite see Christ himself

in his fullness. It was the *fact* of redemption, rather than the details of the *process*, which was seen. The Israelitish form of the kingdom of God was the historical basis of the New Testament form; and the Mosaic institutes were constructed for the primary and immediate benefit of the Israelites of the Old, and secondarily and through them for us of the New Testament form of the same kingdom.

But what was that original and immediate purpose? We can reply here only in brief, and without reference to the various details of the system. As these were numerous, so also was the significance manifold and the whole system must be considered in its relation to the people and times for whom it was primarily intended, rather than in its relation to ourselves. The following points may be noticed:

1. *Idea of the Divine purity.* One object of the system, especially of certain parts, was to convey to the mind of the Israelite a right idea of the purity of Jehovah, the only God. Such in part was the object of the distinction between the different classes of animals as clean and unclean, only the former being admissible as sacrifices; such also in part was the object in having a consecrated priest to offer the sacrifices, instead of permitting every man to offer them for himself; such also was the object of the legal distinctions between the outer court of the sanctuary and the Holy Place, and between the Holy and Most Holy Place, the latter of which could be entered only by the high priest and by him only on one day of the year. This also was in part the object of the various ceremonial purifications.

The nation was in its youth, and in many respects

heathenish. The right idea of the Divine purity and holiness was lost, and had to be reformed by a new and elaborate system of object teaching. No one attribute of the Divine Being is more emphasized in the teachings of Moses, and indeed in the whole Old Testament than that of holiness, and a knowledge of none was more fundamentally essential to the progress of the people in the accomplishment of their redemptive mission.

2. *The moral defilement and guilt of the people.* But not only was it sought to instill a right idea of the Divine purity and holiness, but also a recognition on the part of the people of their own moral defilement and guilt. The two objects would be accomplished in part by the same process and simultaneously. As the idea of their own moral pollution grew, as compared with the immaculate standard of Jehovah's purity, so would their need of spiritual purification be more and more recognized. The ritual of the altar and the divers washings connected with it (Heb. ix, 10) were especially calculated to impress this lesson. Thus also would the Israelite be instructed in his need of pardon, the details of the ritual being addressed, some to his sense of guilt, others to his sense of pollution. These numerous rites were grievous to be borne, but nevertheless were well adapted to the rude and ignorant people for whose benefit they were intended in the first place. The more enlightened and cultured a nation becomes the less its need of numerous rites and elaborate ritual. Little of this sort is expressly provided in the New Testament.

3. *Idea of the Divine justice.* Another object intended to be accomplished was to implant in the mind

of the Israelite the idea of the Divine justice, or of the demerit which accrued to himself by reason of his guilt and pollution. The prescribed penalties consequent upon the violated law were especially calculated to serve this purpose. The whole burnt-offering, and the sin and trespass-offerings were understood to be placatory or a sweet-smelling savor. The fact that the slain victim was for an express purpose consumed upon the altar would be a perpetual declaration to the Israelite of the blameworthiness of sin in the sight of Jehovah. The victim, which was required to be a clean animal and an object of value to the offerer, was slain and burnt on the altar, whereby the sinner might plainly see that sin as personated in himself was something which surely deserved to be punished. Jehovah was thereby declared to be just and also at the same time merciful, for the sacrifice was not merely the symbolization of penalty which should be inflicted upon the sinner himself, but it was also a propitiation because it was a token that the offerer shared Jehovah's intense abhorrence of his sins. Being thus offered sincerely it became on the sinner's part an authorized plea for pardon. Being prescribed as such it was accepted as such, and thus it became an "atonement," or covering, as the word means, whereby was concealed, so to speak, the sinner's sin from Jehovah's eye. Having learned that Jehovah was merciful, the Israelite would be encouraged to crave pardon for sins for which no sacrificial atonement was provided by law. In such cases, as murder, adultery, etc., the plea would be simply the sinner's own penitence and the Divine mercy, without any outward expression of the plea in sacrifice.

Pardon cannot be granted unless it is craved, and it can be craved only as an expression of penitence on the sinner's part and as an act of mercy on Jehovah's part. But to crave it as act of Divine mercy is only another way of admitting the Divine justice in the event the pardon is refused. In this case, and in this case only, is pardon possible; for sins that are *actually* expiated in their relation to the sinner do not also need to be pardoned. The expiation clears the account. The Israelite saw these things in the sacrificial system. A list of sins is expressly given in Lev. vi, 1-7 and iv, 13, in respect to which all the ends of expiation were accomplished, within the sphere at least of Israel's temporal relation to Jehovah as the recognized king of the theocracy. By the atonements thus provided and required by law, the Israelite would be kept perpetually mindful of the fact that he reached the Divine favor in all cases on no basis of his personal merit whatsoever, but on the ground of a pure Divine act of mercy,—which mercy, however, could be extended to the offender only on his recognition of the necessity of expiation; or in other words, by endorsing the sacrifice as his own, and hence as in lieu of himself. To do this would be to penitently acknowledge his guilt and pollution, and also in turn the Divine justice, and thereby render pardon possible. But it would not be right to say that the Divine justice is satisfied by being wreaked on the slain victim; it is really not expended on anything, but is satisfied or withheld by the sinner's thorough and sincere endorsement of all that the sacrifice symbolizes. And as the animal victim was to the Israelites of the Old Testament, so is the Christ victim to us of the New.

4. *The sentiment of gratitude.* Another object aimed at was the preservation in the heart of the sentiment of gratitude and hence of loving loyalty to Jehovah. To this the great historical festivals of the Passover, Pentecost, and the Tabernacles, were eminently conducive. The meat-offering and peace-offering were also eucharistic. The preservation and perpetual periodical enkindlement of the sense of gratitude would also tend to secure the people against the fashionable idolatry of their neighbors, and induce a spirit and habit of affectionate obedience to Jehovah. This, doubtless, was one of the fundamental objects aimed at by the whole system. It is safe for no man, however enlightened, to separate himself wholly from all outward embodiment of his inward religion. As our modern church edifice, and the worship which it represents, are fundamental to our modern civilization, so were the Tabernacle and the Mosaic ritual to the Israelitish civilization; and this civilization did not terminate in itself, but is the basis or germ of all Christian civilizations. The Israelite, like every other man, must have his religious *cultus*, and being provided with one of his own, he would be less liable to adopt at any time the idolatrous and in other respects less perfect one of his neighbors. And, burdened with innumerable observances as it was, which yet failed of themselves to give the conscience peace, the natural effect would be a preparation to more keenly appreciate the liberty of the New Testament system, when in the fullness of time it should appear.

5. *The memorial or retrospective value.* As the name of Jehovah, whether of recent or remote origin, was the memorial name whereby the memory of the

fact would be perpetuated that God had entered into a covenant relation with the Israelitish people, so was the sacrificial system retrospective, in part, in its significance. It was the outward expression of the memory of an ancient promise of redemption, and of faith in the promise on the part of the one sacrificing. Without the outward expression of both the memory and the faith both would have become extinct and there would have been no basis for further educational procedure. But the promise back to which the sacrifice looked was ever in unbroken process of fulfillment, a redemption realized in its individual aspects in the present passing experience of the Israelite; and not a redemption at some time in the future but now only hoped for. The Israelite did not understand the mystery of the method, the mystery of God incarnate, but he had faith in the expressed redemptive purpose, to his memory of which and to his faith in which, his sacrifice bore testimony. His individual Redeemer was One who had, essentially, already come. The heathen offered sacrifices; but in so far as these sacrifices stood in any relation at all to redemption, they were the expression on the heathen's part only of a faint and vague hope, whereas the Israelite was pointed to a *past fact*—God's promise of redemption. The heathen believed as best he could without the encouragement of the past fact, and hence his sacrifice had to him no memorial value.

And when Christ actually came, and made redemption historic, the Mosaic system, so far as its memorial value was concerned, might have been continued in vogue. Instead, however, of pointing men backward to the expressed divine purpose, or to "the Lamb

slain from the foundation of the world," it might have pointed them backward to the Lamb slain in time. And it was necessary that there should be some means of doing this. But the Mosaic system had become needlessly cumbersome and burdensome, and imbedded in Jewish thought in relations quite apart from the historic Christ. For these reasons it would be both easier and better to institute a new memorial system than it would be to change the popular thought in regard to the old system, and adapt it to a new purpose. Hence, the institution of the ministry of the gospel, the rites of baptism, and the Lord's Supper, etc. The popular thought had veered from the original divine intention as to the old system, and the best way, if not the only way, whereby to correct the error, was to abrogate the old system. But the Apostle James, even regarding him for the moment as uninspired, was not wrong in supposing that certain features of the Mosaic system and the gospel plan of salvation might be retained side by side, provided men would only do so intelligently; for, after all, those under the two dispensations respectively who were saved at all were saved essentially in the same way.

§2. *The Star of Balaam.*

Another remarkable prophecy, or rather, series of prophecies, is that of the semi-heathen Balaam, found in Num. xxiii, 7-10, 20-24; xxiv, 5-9, 17-24. The whole episode of Balaam and Balak, recorded in chapters xii-xxiv, is peculiar in several respects. In the first place, the scene lies wholly outside of the camp of Israel, and wholly in that of the enemy. The Israelites knew nothing of much, at least, that was then taking place from the beginning to the end of the epi-

sode, or from the time when Balak first sent to Mesopotamia for Balaam to the conclusion of the latter's prophecy. If, therefore, these prophecies are to be studied and interpreted from the standpoint of Israel's recognized relation to them, the place of such study in our scheme evidently depends upon the time when Israel first became acquainted with the contents of the prophecies.

Another peculiarity, growing out of the first, which must be mentioned here, is the parenthetical character of the record of the episode as it stands in the book of Numbers. We may evidently pass directly from ch. xxii, 1, to ch. xxv, without breaking in the least the narrative of the history of Israel. While the events recorded in the intervening section were occurring, the Israelites were quietly in their camps which they had recently "pitched in the plains of Moab, on this side Jordan by Jericho" (xxii, 1); and the narrative of these events has no structural connection with the preceding and subsequent record. It is a parenthesis possessing literary characteristics wholly peculiar to itself.

But we cannot on these grounds infer anything concerning the date of its composition or its authorship, though as to order of time, it is evident that it occupies the right place in the record. The life of Moses was, at the most, within a few weeks of its close, his last public service being the destruction of the Midianites, the allies of Balak, a short time after the prophecies of Balaam were uttered. In the tents of the conquered leaders of Moab and Midian, the Israelites doubtless learned the story of Balaam and his recent prophecies. So remarkable a testimonial was it of the present importance and future glory of Israel that

Moses, or Eleazer, or other divinely-guided hand doubtless immediately wrote it, as a kind of sacred drama, and inserted it in its proper place among the records of Israel. It was the testimonial of one whom they knew would have cursed them if he could; of one whom all the peoples round about regarded as a man of no ordinary insight into things future, and one whom even kings delighted to honor and revere.

Whatever may be said of the morality and doctrinal status of the Israelites at this period of their history, they were intensely religious. They did not always believe in Jehovah, but they always believed in God (*Elohim*), and worshiped him, albeit sometimes in an impure way and under forbidden names. Taking such considerations as these into the estimate, and the additional facts that Balaam spoke under invisible constraint and in opposition to his own interest, we may easily suppose that the Israelites would as readily believe his words in this instance as they had ever at any time believed the words of Moses himself.

Nor is it to be regarded as without significance that in this narrative the name Jehovah and the name God (*Elohim*) are used interchangeably. So far as the effect upon the Israelites themselves is concerned, it does not matter whether we suppose that Balaam himself really used the Israelitish and covenant name of the Divine Being, or whether Moses, or Eleazer, in writing up the matter, put that name into his mouth, as being the equivalent of the one which Balaam did use. Balaam must have known God as the covenant God of Israel, or, in other words, as Jehovah; but whether so or not, the Israelites themselves would know very well from

this interchange of the names that if any God at all authorized Balaam to speak—and they would not doubt that one did—it must have been their God, Jehovah; and this would be the conclusion even of those who might not believe that Jehovah was the only God. This circumstance, therefore, would only secure the readier assent of the Israelites to the wondrous words of Balaam, the enemy's great prophet, and yet in no way misrepresent the essential facts. At the time, however, when the Israelites had reached this stage of their history, they were very well advertised throughout the surrounding nations, and the fame of the name Jehovah doubtless went with their fame. Both Balaam and Balak must have been well acquainted with it, as we see that Rahab, the harlot, of Jericho, was, shortly after this. (Josh. ii, 10f.) And as Balaam, whether addressing Balak or Balak's messenger, was speaking of the Israelites, it was natural and in accordance with custom that he should use the Israelitish name of God, or the name of the Israelitish God, according as we suppose him to have been a believer in one or many gods.

Balaam spoke under the impulsion of the Holy Spirit, just as did the inspired prophets of a later day, though he spoke unwittingly, and in opposition to his previous selfish purpose. Our question here is, not what larger meaning we may see in his words, in the light of subsequent history and revelation, but, what did the Israelites of that day see in them. There is evidently something in prophecy and revelation generally, which those to whom it was primarily addressed did not and could not perceive. It is like one endeavoring to read a book which is quite beyond his present

advancement, and yet out of which he may obtain much. It is not to be denied that if God revealed at divers times and in divers manners, the contents of the revelations are to be looked at in the first place in the light of the present of that generation to which they were first made.

The words of Balaam were undoubtedly Messianic, as all interpreters, except the purely rationalistic admit, but the Messiah whom the Israelites saw in them was far from being in all respects the Messiah of the New Testament. The Star (ver. 17) was to them not so much a person as it was dominion. The person whom they saw in the prophecy was rather themselves projected in vision on the horizon of the future. The Sceptre, in like manner, was only another name for dominion, pointing them to no particular monarch in the future, but only to themselves as exercising sovereignty over all their enemies; these enemies being naturally represented, as Moab, Edom, and Amalek, who were then the most prominent in their hostility to Israel. The prophecy unfolds not only to us, it unfolded to the Israelites themselves, who first found it in the conquered tents of Moab, "the royal side" of the relation of the Israelites to the nations, and the imagery employed to do this is identical with that employed by both prior and subsequent prophets and by peoples of the orient generally. And what was true of Israel in this respect was true also of Israel's King Messiah.

So this view of the prophecy by no means causes it to lose its significance in relation to the Divine purpose of redemption. It was faith in this Divine purpose, and in themselves as its first human embodiment and agent, and the allegiance to Jehovah which all this im-

plied, that constituted to them the plan of salvation. The Israelites in their organized, or national, capacity, were the kingdom of God; and they so regarded themselves, however gross may have been their conceptions of the nature and significance of this kingdom. Their victories were, nevertheless, the victories of the kingdom of God, successive steps in the process of reducing all other kingdoms to subjection under the same Sceptre. At a later day, when Israel also had a king, the personal King Messiah himself became visible to them in prophecy. But for the present, on the Mountains of Moab, flushed with victory over Bashan and the Amorites, and yet in conflict with their enemies, what message would be more opportune than the one setting forth Israel's royal work of subjugation and dominion? There is still an Israel that still needs the message oft repeated.

§ 3. *The Prophet Promised.*

The kingdom of God had been formally provided with an organized priesthood whose function, it had been expressly declared, should be perpetual in the line of Phinehas of the family of Aaron. (Num. xxv, 12, 13) "Therefore say, Lo, I give unto him my covenant of peace; and it shall be unto him, and to his seed after him, the covenant of an everlasting priesthood, because he was jealous for his God, and made atonement for the children of Israel." The words find their highest fulfillment in the priesthood of the Saviour of mankind, though it is not probable that the Israelites saw in them more than the majority of Christians have seen in them since,—the mere bestowment of perpetual honor upon Phinehas and his house because

of his extraordinary zeal in defense of the honor of Jehovah.

If in the Mosaic polity no order of kings is expressly provided, we do have among the very last words of Moses, and in the same address in which the priesthood is presupposed, a distinct presage of such an order (Deut. xvii, 14-20)—a passage that bears upon its very surface evidence that it is not the interpolation of a later writer. The Mosaic institutions had no greater affinity for one special form of civil government than for another, being sufficiently elastic to adapt themselves, within certain limits, to any form. But it seems evident, especially in view of all the historical surroundings, that the idea and function of Israel as the kingdom of God would admit of easiest development under the monarchical form of government. The Israelites were to be more and more clearly revealed to themselves as the kingdom of God, and a Messiah was to be more and more clearly revealed unto them in his capacity of king of that kingdom. These revelations could be understood only in so far as they were founded upon an historical basis, the outgrowth of the Israelite's own experience and observation—the visible king being the object lesson whereby was set forth to them the One yet invisible. Accordingly the order of things was anticipated by Moses, and instructions, such as the present surroundings and condition of the people would enable them to understand, were laid down for their guidance.

Finally, and in the same farewell address of Moses, the prophet-order is provided (Deut. xviii, 15-19). “According to all that thou didst ask from Jehovah, thy God, in Horeb, in the day of the assembly, saying,

'I cannot again hear the voice of Jehovah, my God, and this great fire I cannot see again, lest I die'; and Jehovah said unto me, 'They have done well in what they have spoken. A prophet will I raise up for them from the midst of their brethren, like unto them; and I will give my words into his mouth, and he will speak unto them all that I charge him. And it will come to pass that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he will speak in my name, I will require it of him.'"

There was undoubtedly a larger meaning in this message than was actually conveyed to the mind of the Israelite who heard it from the mouth of Moses. He would understand from it, and rightly, that Moses, though soon to be taken from them, should have a successor; that the organization of the kingdom of God was not to find its completion in its priesthood and civil government; that there should continue to be a recognized mediatorship between the members of the kingdom and Jehovah himself, even as Moses had been such mediator during the forty years of his administration, and especially at Sinai; and that that mediator would be the medium through whom special instruction should be communicated to them from time to time, and which could not be anticipated at the outset once for all. Unto him should the people hearken. The assurance thus granted them would not only, in some measure, reconcile them to the death of their great spiritual leader, but would especially guard them against all forms of necromancy and soothsaying, such as were resorted to by the nations round about them, for the purpose of obtaining insight into the future or information in matters beyond the grasp of the ordi-

nary human faculties. The people would evidently interpret the message, in the light of the words spoken a few moments before (verses 10–14), and would evidently see that the promise of a prophet-successor of Moses was meant, in part at least, to secure them against the treasonable practices there mentioned,—practices, the oftener resorted to the more the minds and hearts of the people would be necessarily withdrawn from Jehovah. If any man lacks wisdom let him seek it of Jehovah through Jehovah's authorized speaker, was probably the practical burden of the message as heard by the Israelites. And if this Speaker should not be hearkened unto by the people Jehovah would require it of them by raising up for a time no prophet among them. He would leave them to their own evil, which in due time would bring its punishment.

Thus understood, the message of Moses would prepare the people to see even in Joshua, not merely a military and civil leader, but also a spiritual guide and mediator in special emergencies. So also of Samuel, Nathan, Elijah, and all the rest of the prophets of Jehovah, in order to test the Divine call of whom infallible criteria were furnished in the same message (verses 20–22). The people were used to prophets; but the prophets of that order which is here cleansed of its heathen impurities, and in the words of Moses, stamped with the Divine sanction, were to deliver no false messages and resort to no tricks of necromancy or other form of divination.

But it by no means follows that the words do not refer eminently to Christ, the Prophet greater than Moses. As the people advanced through the centuries,

and increased in knowledge and wisdom, it came to be recognized that the prophet-order as such, that no one prophet hitherto, had exhausted the meaning of the message of Moses. The prophet-order would be meaningless and valueless if one Prophet were not included in it. The series of prophets would be without significance if the last number of the series were omitted. Hence the message found its highest fulfillment in him who was the truest prophet of all, and whom Moses himself may have seen from the beginning. Our Lord expressly declares that Moses wrote of him (Jno. v, 45-47); but whether he did so consciously or unconsciously, or with an understanding of the details concerning Christ's person and office, we cannot know with certainty. There may be more in the inspired words of the speaker than there was in the mind or understanding of the speaker or writer. Our Lord in making this declaration cannot be supposed to have reference to any other words of Moses than this passage, for this is the only place in which he, speaking in his own person, makes any prediction of the kind. In the New Testament times the Messianic interpretation of the passage was the one generally accredited by both Jews, Samaritans, and Christians.

DIVISION III.

PERIOD OF THE PROPHETS.

Definition.

As Mosaism dealt with the objective development of the Old Testament religion as exhibited in the historical and doctrinal contents of the Pentateuch, so prophetism deals with the same subject as exhibited in the historical and prophetic contents from the entrance into Canaan to the close of the Old Testament revelation. By objective development is still to be understood the growth to which the religion of Israel, considered in its totality, attained from age to age by reason of revelations communicated to Israel from without, as distinguished from the subjective development due to the exercise, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, of the Israelite's own natural capabilities of thought. Prophetism, therefore, as well as Mosaism, in this narrower and stricter sense, excludes the inspired meditations of the so-called Wisdom books (Job, Ecclesiastes, etc.), the contents of which must be discussed apart by themselves as a parallel line of religious growth. Prophetism is both the historical and doctrinal continuation and fulfillment of the earlier revelation, securing the observance by the people to whom it was immediately addressed of the precepts laid down in the Pentateuch, and developing at the same time its doctrinal contents, and adding thereto essentially new elements.

Prophetism, like Mosaism, must be treated both in its historical and doctrinal aspects, as well as in its nature and peculiar characteristics.

CHAPTER I.

PROPHETISM HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

§ 1. Civil and Religious Characteristics of this Period.

1. *The Times of the Judges.* The prospects opened up for Israel by the legislation of Moses, and the initial successes of Joshua, were not fully realized. "The great design was imperfectly executed." The period of the judges, extending over a period of more than three hundred years, is characterized by a series of six recorded apostasies, of longer or shorter duration, from the worship of Jehovah as the only God, and the adoption of the nature worship of the Canaanites; these intervals of apostacy being followed by periods of chastisement in the form of oppressions by the heathen nations, and these in turn by seasons of repentance, and prayer to Jehovah again, and deliverance through judges raised up for the purpose. The following points may here be noticed:

(1). The remnant of unconquered Canaanites left by Joshua in the land, and the Divine overruling therein (Judges ii, 19-23; iii, 1-4). They were as thorns in the sides of the Israelites, and their gods were a snare unto them; they became instruments of chastisement which Jehovah used when the people disobeyed him.

(2). The Canaanite *Nature-worship.* The religion of the Canaanites was a form of Pantheism. It regarded Deity as identical with the generating, pre-

serving, and destroying power of nature. Baal, Astarte, Dagon, etc., were the different manifestations of this power of nature personified and worshipped in bloody and lewd forms. The Mosaic religion on the other hand, regarded the Deity as entirely distinguished from nature, infinitely exalted above it, almighty and omnipresent in it, and employing it as an instrument of his will. It was extremely essential that Israel should be kept in, and be nurtured in, this faith. Hence the significance, and offensiveness to Jehovah, of Israel's apostacies.

(3). The office of the Judges. This was not of a permanent character. The Judges, or Shophetim, were raised up from time to time by Jehovah, in cases of great affliction, for the purpose of delivering the people from their enemies (Judg. ii, 16), and usually retained, after their task had been performed, a more or less definitely recognized judicial and magistratic power as long as they lived. Their position and duties were allied to those of the prophets—they were prophets in action. During this whole period of the judges the people were to a great extent taught *by events* simply. “The lessons of the nation were communicated by means of facts, disaster following idolatry, and prosperity coming after the surrender of idols, were never far from their experience. They were taught most impressively that the way of the transgressors is hard, but that the fear of God is the highway to blessing.” (Blackie.)

(4). But though the lapses of the people into idolatry were frequent, clearly showing that a pure, spiritual worship is distasteful to the natural heart, and that men are partial to a religion which reaches them

through images and symbols, rather than to be brought “into heart-to-heart contact with the unseen God;” yet, in order to duly appreciate the character of the times it should be remembered that these periods of apostacy were followed by times of repose, faithfulness, and comparative prosperity, extending in some instances over intervals of forty and even eighty years. During these times of peace, the people, for the most part, lived a simple, quiet, unambitious, country life, having but little, and aspiring to little, of the arts and refinements of modern civilization. Music, and poetry, and fancy needle-work were, however, not altogether neglected (*Judges v, 1-31*). But the stories of Micah, and of the tragedy of Gibeah, of Abimilech’s murders, and of Eli’s polluted sons, illustrate the irregularities of worship, and brutal state of morals which prevailed to a greater or less extent even in times of peace (*Ch. ix, xvii, xix; 1 Sam. iii, 11-14*).

2. The period of Samuel and the undivided kingdom is characterized chiefly by

(1). The restoration by Samuel of the theocratic unity of the tribes which had been greatly weakened by the civil and religious irregularities of the times of the judges. The central national worship was revived, and the tribes were brought back to a recognition of the fact that they were the one covenant people of Jehovah.

(2). The rise of prophecy and the organization by Samuel of schools of prophets (*1 Sam. xix, 18; 2 Kings ii, 3-5; iv, 38*). The prophetic office now acquired a permanent character, and prophecy, instead of the priesthood, became the conscience of the state.

(3). The establishment of the monarchy and the

royal dignity; Jehovah's design in this being, *first*, to furnish the nation with a visible bond and point of union and a head, and, *second*, to enable the people to more adequately apprehend and appreciate further revelations concerning the Messiah in his royal character. The kingdom and the king were to become "object lessons" to the people in relation to the Messianic kingdom and king.

3. The period from the division of the kingdom, at the beginning of Rehoboam's reign, to the close of the canon, is characterized by

(1). The chronic hostility between the kingdom of Judah and the kingdom of Israel, until the latter was finally overthrown forever by the Assyrian power.

(2). The establishment of the worship of Jehovah in high places, which was a willful and sinful renewal of the Patriarchal form wholly inconsistent with the covenant oneness of the people and the appointed centralized national worship. The worship in high places was appropriate in the earliest ages, for the elevation, or hill, is an altar of nature, and a fixed place for the worship of the God of nature, if not of grace; but in this more advanced period, when the kingdom of God had been already further developed, and grace was becoming more and more paramount to nature, such worship was a sinful opposition to the Divinely appointed worship at the tabernacle and the temple. It was also a rapid step toward the nature worship of the heathens round about who had their altars in the high places and the groves.

(3). By the establishment of idolatrous calf worship in the kingdom of Israel, the political object of which was to prevent the people from going to the temple

in Jerusalem to worship, and thereby widen the breach between Israel and Judah. The result was a remarkable defection of both kings and people from Jehovah.

(4). By the increased number and influence of the prophets, and the great courage and holy zeal with which they endeavored to counteract the untheocratic degeneracy of kings and people, this degeneracy increasing more and more, however, until it culminated first in the Assyrian exile of Israel, and subsequently in the Babylonian captivity of Judah, and the overthrow of Jerusalem and the temple.

(5). By the new phase which prophecy assumed after the time of Elijah and Elisha. Before, and including, their day it was rather simply a successor of Moses, being characterized as one may readily see, mainly by zeal for the law and the right worship of Jehovah; afterwards, however, while it by no means neglects the law and the true worship, it appears rather as the Harbinger of Christ. The conception of the Messiah became fully distinct and acquired a complete form. The kingdom of David should pass away, but the prophets after Elisha delight to dwell upon it as the symbol of a Kingdom which should never pass away. The stock of David, it was foreseen, should become a decayed stump, but from it should spring a king who should reign forever. The current form of worship should also cease, but it was the symbol of a worship which should never cease.

(6). By the rigid monotheism of the exile and post-exilic periods as contrasted with the former persistent idolatrous tendency: also the use during the captivity of the synagogue worship, or "little sanctuaries" (Ezek. xi, 16).

§ 2. The Rise of the Prophetic Order.

1. The prophetic function was never a new thing to the Hebrew, nor indeed to any people even outside of the sphere of the Biblical revelation. Heathenism has always abounded in men and women who have been recognized by their contemporaries, if not by posterity, as prophets.

The psychological explanation of this historical fact is not far to seek. The instinctive desire of all men to see the invisible and know the future predisposes them in the first place to accept prophetic messages, apart from any evidences whatsoever of their truth. This is the psychological basis of prophecy, without which it would not be possible for man to be reached through prophecy. And so there were prophets and prophecies within the sphere of revelation from the beginning. Adam was a prophet, being made one by his acceptance immediately from God of the information concerning future redemption, as stated in Gen. iii, 15. Enoch also was a prophet, and Noah, Abraham, and Jacob. The Israelites never at any time regarded it as strange that these patriarchs should have seen the invisible and the future, and that men should have believed their messages. Nor is it strange to us. It would have been far the greater wonder had there been no prophets. When the dying Jacob foretells the future of his sons they accept his words as a matter of course, and without questioning; though their truth could actually be made known only by their fulfillment (Deut. xviii, 21, 22).

2. The Israelites of the time of Moses were familiar with the word *nabi* (prophet), and of course with that which the word designated. He himself was one; and

when he said, "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me," they understood *what* it was that was to be raised up, though they may not have clearly understood *whom*. They knew that prophecy as a function was not to cease with Moses, though the words were doubtless not meant to be wholly restricted to any particular prophet, or to formally provide for the organization, or establishment, of any order or class of spiritual officers that should be called prophets. For this there was no express provision in the Mosaic constitution, and there could in the very nature of the case have been none without putting the constitution, so far, in advance of the circumstances of the people. The prophet must as yet continue to be as he had hitherto been, only an individual and not an institution or official class. The institution, like the monarchical form of government, must be a natural outgrowth of later circumstances, otherwise there would be no popular want met and it could not flourish.

3. But to what historical circumstances was the organization of an order of prophets immediately due? We must find the answer to the question partly in that which the priesthood failed to do, and partly in that which the order of prophets did accomplish.

To the sacerdotal order was originally entrusted the function of teacher and governor of the people in matters spiritual and ecclesiastical. Doubtless they also were originally the physicians and teachers of the secular schools, in so far as there were any. But they did not long adequately fulfill the task assigned them. With neglect of duty and corrupt practices the priesthood was soon reduced to a low condition; and the

people sank with it. The frequent defections of the people, during the time of the judges, from their allegiance to Jehovah presuppose a sad want of spiritual vitality and energy on the part of the priests. The government being a sort of religio-political institution, the priests were a part of it, and hence they were not only *in* the world, but were also *of* the world, and both priests and people glided rapidly into dark times.

Then it was that Samuel was raised up. He seems to have been a Levite incorporated into the tribe of Ephraim (1 Sam. i; 1 Chron. vi, 22, 23). He was a prophet both in function and in office, and in order that his influence might be recognized and felt as such, it was not necessary that stress should be laid upon his tribal descent. It was not a strange thing to the people that he should speak with authority on other ground than his connection with the priestly tribe. He established the Prophetic Order, in which sense he came to be regarded as the first of the prophets (Acts iii, 24). After him the succession was unbroken. He seems to have been the founder of the prophetic school (1 Sam. xix, 20), which were similar in constitution and purpose to our theological institutions. The disciples of these schools studied music, and poetry, and the law (1 Sam. x, 5, 10; 1 Chron. xxv, 1, 6). They became the teachers of the people, the annalists and historians, the physicians, the conservators of patriotism, morals, and spiritual religion, and the counsellors of kings, not only in private but also in public matters, which the true prophet recognized as being affairs of the kingdom of God. They wore a kind of uniform, and could be recognized as prophets at sight (2 Kings i, 8). They had nothing to do with the func-

tions of the priests, but were even more influential than the priests (Jer. ii, 8; iv, 9; v, 31, etc.) Kings both respected and feared them. They were not only a powerful but also a numerous class. Obadiah concealed one hundred at a time from the wrath of Jezebel, an unknown number having already been cut off by her. Ahab, king of Israel, gathered together four hundred prophets of the Lord, and there was doubtless a large number in both Israel and Judah in quieter times.

But not all who belonged to the prophetic order were true prophets possessed of the prophetic gift. The majority even of the Jehovah-prophets, were doubtless without the gift, and were prophets only in respect to education and class-feeling. Nor was there always agreement among them, so far, indeed, did some differ from others in their views and teachings as justly to entitle them to be called "false" prophets. The condition of the government and of the people was generally such as to call forth much difference of opinion as to matters both of public policy and private morals. It is scarcely to be supposed, however, that the prophets who stood in such persistent opposition to Jehovah, for example (Ch. xxvii, 9, 16, etc.), were thereby standing in consciously wicked opposition to Jehovah. It was to some extent, at least, a difference of opinion. They were the optimists, as they thought themselves. Matters, in their opinion, were not going to the bad, as Jeremiah so dolefully and persistently asserted; as witnessed to the contrary the vigorous reform measures of Josiah and Hezekiah. Were not the priests still active in their ministrations? Were not the daily sacrifices still offered? And was the temple service ever so magnificent as now?

But however honest in their views some of these false prophets may have been, they were nevertheless guilty, and the mass of them fearfully corrupt (*Jer.* vi, 13; viii, 10; xiv, 13–16; xxiii, 1–40), and as they prophesied in harmony with the natural tendency of the people, they were not lacking in influence enough to lead the nation to ruin. Their words were the offspring of their wishes, and their predictions were at the most only forecastings, and only by the outcome could the false be distinguished from the true. Though all claimed to be prophets, comparatively few of the prophetic order were inspired; though some priests and others, who were not formally members of the order, were possessed of this prophetic gift. The whole number making up the inspired list from the close of Solomon's reign to the time of Malachi does not exceed thirty, and extends over a period of about five hundred and fifty years. The other seers, or prophets, "or teachers in Israel," were doubtless in no respect superior in endowments or acquirements to our modern clergy, and doubtless the majority of them were inferior to them in morals. It is probable that even the thirty, who are mentioned as having been inspired, were not permanently endowed with the spirit of inspiration. "The word of the Lord" came to them at such times as he saw it was wise and needful thus to communicate with them. Notwithstanding the class was numerous, it would seem, therefore, after all, to have been a small minority, especially for so long a period and so stiff-necked a people. It was a small number, even after making due allowance for those who, like Elijah and Elisha, wrote nothing, and for the still larger number whose names are not mentioned. Prophe-

etical colleges in those days could make neither heart nor brains. And as for supernatural endowment, we reverently think that God was much more likely to inspire a man who had a basis of natural gifts with which to begin. Not every young Hebrew who attended the prophetical schools, and had the diploma, and wore the uniform of the order, was capable of being inspired. The Elijahs, Isaiahs, and Jeremias, if distributed evenly along the course of prophetic history would scarcely furnish two for each century. But these were enough. Not many generals are needed. There have not been many Savonarolas and Luthers. Samuel stood alone in his day. And the ministry of the prophets was not a failure. Neither as a protest, nor as a prophecy, did it die when the prophet died.

4. But it was not the duty of the prophetic class whether inspired or uninspired merely to teach and preach, protest and prophecy. It became a part of their function, and a very important part, to make a record of the Divine utterances, and thus provide for their permanent existence; and in doing this they were guarded by the Holy Spirit from error. It is probable that not only the prophetical books strictly so-called, but also the historical books, were written by men who belonged to the prophetic order; so that the historical books in this sense also may be called books of the prophets, as they actually are called in the Hebrew Bibles. The written prophecies, in the narrower sense of the term, are records, whether made by the men who originally spoke them or not, of the revelations of Jehovah to the men selected by him to make known his will to his chosen people. And these prophecies were not merely of local and temporary value, and

were not designed by their divine Author so to be. The will of God is the same, under the same circumstances, in all ages and nations; and, besides this, the Jew as well as the Christian, of all subsequent times, may see in the fulfillment of predictions which occur in the history of prophecy a proof that the Bible is in all respects what it pretends to be.

§ 3. *Periods of Biblical Prophecy.*

The first period extends from Adam to Samuel, and includes the antedeluvian, patriarchal, and Mosaic preludes of the brighter day and has been briefly discussed in the preceding section. These were only sporadic, or occasional, instances of the exercise of the prophetic function, and occurred only at intervals of centuries. The characteristic feature of the special prophecy of this earliest period, as compared with the later, is that of revelation as contrasted with inspiration; that is, in the former the Lord spake *to* man, while in the latter he spake *through* man. Beyond this, so far as the human speaker himself was concerned, prophecy was merely a private utterance, and in the estimation of the people generally, carried with it no greater weight than the wisdom of an oriental patriarch was able to impart to it; whereas, the prophecy of subsequent periods had the weight rather of official utterance.

The following classification of post-Davidic prophets is substantially the one proposed by Van Til, in the early part of the eighteenth century. It is naturally suggested by the history of the times, and is followed in the main by writers generally:

1. The prophets of Judah and Israel to the time of the overthrow of the latter, B. C., 721.

2. The prophets of Judah from the overthrow of Israel to the final overthrow of Judah and Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, B. C., 586.
3. The prophets of the captivity, B. C., 586–516.
4. The prophets of the restoration.

The line of separation between these periods cannot be rigidly drawn, as in each case one period more or less overlaps another. Isaiah, for example, prophesied, both before and after the overthrow of Israel, and Jeremiah both before and after the overthrow of Judah and Jerusalem. Orelli prefers to find the epochs, or dividing points, outside of the history of the chosen people, and arranges as follows:

1. The prophets of the pre-Assyrian age,—Elijah, Elisha, Obadiah, Joel.
2. The prophets of the Assyrian age in the northern kingdom,—Amos, Hosea, Zechariah ix–xi.
3. The prophets of the Assyrian age in the southern kingdom,—Isaiah, i, xxxix, Micah, Nahum.
4. The prophets of the Decline, or Chaldean period,—Zephaniah, Habakuk, Jeremiah, Zechariah, xii–xiv.
5. The prophets of the Exile,—Ezekiel, Isaiah, xl–lxvi.
6. The prophets after the exile, or the Persian period,—Haggai, Zechariah, i–viii, Malachi, Daniel's Apocalypse.

The chronological place of several of the prophets and prophecies is a matter of unsettled debate among writers. As this, however, is not the place to discuss the subject, we must simply assume, as we have occasion, what seems to be the best conclusions of historical criticism, and arrange the results of our study accordingly,—saying only at present that the reasons for

placing Isaiah and Zechariah as is done in Orelli's scheme do not appear to us to be sufficient.

In any event, however, it is worth while to observe here the general fact, that the darkest period of the Israelitish political history was the most brilliant period of Israelitish prophecy. Especially is this true of the times subsequent to the judges. The national sins, and confusions, and defeats, and exiles became the best occasion of its rise and development. The more imminent the danger that the ship of church and state would sink, the more vigorous the cry of warning and the effort put forth by the faithful prophet to save it. And had there been no night, there had been no song of the dawn. Had there been no clouds, there had been no rainbow. Prophecy brought to the people in their darkest hour a larger hope of the resurrection both in the national and in the individual or personal sense of the term; and the root of the hope lay in the gloom of the present, as it is only night that can make us think of morning and a brighter day. Prophecy also brought during these periods of national degeneracy and calamity a larger anticipation of judgment after death. While it did not displace Mosaism, and did not seek to do so, it became its consumation and fulfillment. It cared not much for sacrifices and offerings (*Isa. i, 11-15; Jer. vii, 4*), but by placing its greater emphasis on repentance and the spiritual nature of God's requirements (*Isa. i, 16-18; Jer. vii, 5-7, etc.*), prepared the way for the abolition of ritual and symbol. But while the prophets, even in periods of greatest gloom, never lose sight of the national identity, but are ever jealous of it, they do ere long mount the partition wall between Israel and the Gentiles, and

proclaim a kingdom of God which having its center at Jerusalem shall embrace all nations, and permeate them with its benign influence (Isa. ii, 2-4; Micah. 10, 1-6, etc.). This, however, leads us into Messianic prophecy, the chief glory of Israel's most brilliant prophetic age, and the failure on the part of the later Jews to rightly apprehend which so largely influenced their treatment of Jesus, and consequently the whole contents of the New Testament.

CHAPTER II.

NATURE AND CHARACTERISTICS OF PROPHECY.

§ 1. *The Prophetic Gift.*

The prophetic gift is to be distinguished from the prophetic office. Many were prophets who were not inspired, and some were inspired who were not prophets as to office. Amos was not a professional prophet, and had not been educated in the professional school (Amos vii, 11). The sixteen prophets whose books are in the canon have that place of honor, not because they belonged to the prophetic order, but because they were endowed with the prophetic gift. "There were hundreds of prophets contemporary with each of these sixteen prophets; and no doubt numberless compositions in sacred poetry and numberless moral exhortations were issued from the several schools, but only sixteen books find their place in the canon. Why is this?" What circumstance was it, which in his own

consciousness, gave authority to his word, and enrolled him among the prophets even though his name were not on the register of the collegians?

The fact that gave or helped to give him authority among the people was, no doubt, the fact that he belonged, even though in some instances informally, to a recognized and influential institution which had come into prominence in the days of the mighty revival under Samuel. At the time of Elijah, or Isaiah, or the later prophets, it had long been "gray with years;" and therefore the institution itself "to many was god-like," aside from any personal weight of character which any individual member of it might have. The prophet, as we have seen, was the educated and wise man of the day; the counsellor, not only of the people, but of the kings also. He wore the professional costume; and whether intrinsically a true prophet or a false one, exacted and received the respect due to his office. It was not a strange thing, therefore, that both kings and people should have been misled by false prophets; and, however considerable the former may have been, the latter were always more so. "Woe be unto the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture, saith the Lord * * * Behold I will visit upon you the evil of your doings, saith the Lord, and [but] I will gather the remnant of my flock out of the countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them again to their folds," (Jer. xxiii, 1 f.). . . .

But while the people may not always have been able to distinguish between the true prophets and the false, the true prophet had more than the outward sign. He carried with him a prophetic consciousness of his

inward gift which rendered him twice armed and doubly strong. Nor was this conviction merely of ordinary or natural origin, such as might have been shared by the false prophet. It was from above. It was peculiar to the true prophet. He did not know himself to be a prophet, merely because of a conscious possession of any natural gifts,—for even the false prophet may have recognized in himself the presence of natural gifts, whereas the true prophet was by no means ready to do so (Ex. x, 10; Jer. i, 6); not because of any predilection which he may have had for the office, for not all prophets had such predilection, “Ah, Lord God! behold I cannot speak; for I am a child,” was doubtless the cry of others than Jeremiah. The true prophet knew himself to be such by virtue of a divine call, an irrepressible appeal to his conscience, as the true minister of the gospel knows himself to be such by his conscious endowment with the enlightening, sanctifying, and strengthening spirit of God. Thus the true prophet knew that he was a prophet even in the moments when he was not inspired; and thus he knew, at the times of his inspiration, that the message he delivered was the message of God. He could not withhold it, even if he would (Jer. xx, 9). “The Lord hath given me the tongue of them that are taught,” said Isaiah, “that I should know how to sustain with words him that is weary; he waketh morning by morning, he waketh mine ear to hear as them that are taught,” (l, 4). “The Lord God hath spoken; who can but prophecy?” (Amos iii, 8). And so far as each special prophetic utterance was concerned, it was not sufficient that the prophets’ call should have been made once for all; each utterance was the result of a special

“communication of the Divine to the human spirit,” whether received by vision or “the word of the Lord” (Isa. vi. 1; Jer. ii, 1).

But the false prophets most of whom doubtless had been members of the schools, and wore the official costume, spoke lying divination after the manner of the heathen, out of their own hearts (2 Kings xvii, 17; Jer. xiv, 14; Ezek. xiii, 7). They followed their own spirit, and were like foxes in the waste places. They went not up into the gaps, neither made up the fence for the house of Israel to stand in the battle in the day of the Lord (Ezek. xiii, 5).

§ 2. *Hebrew Prophecy and Heathen Mantism.*

The Septuagint translators rightly rendered the Hebrew word *nabi* by the Greek word *prophet*, instead of the word *mantis*; mantism in the west and shamanism in the east being the general terms designating the means whereby the heathen world sought to gratify its thirst for divine revelation. The object of both was, in general, to inform man how to do what was right and pleasing to the Being whom it regarded as supreme; but even a slight comparison of the two with each other enables us to see how far mantism fell below prophecy, with which some have so incorrectly allied it. Hebrew prophecy is something unique. It is characteristic only of the religion of Israel, nothing closely resembling it being found anywhere in heathenism, not even in Mohamedanism or the religion of any other Shemitic peoples. Mantism flourished most in the darkest periods of heathenism. It could not stand the test of advancing culture and criticism; the more philosophy increased, the more mantism declined. Not

so with prophecy; its most brilliant period being the most brilliant of the Hebrew culture and criticism. Mantism and Shamanism could sustain themselves even at their best only by resorting to the flight of birds, the entrails of animals, the motion of the stars, the sighing of the wind, enigmatic characters, unnatural frenzies, observations of tortoise-shells, ventriloquism, clairvoyance, and the various machinery of divination. Prophecy, in its best age especially, had no appliances. It stood alone, sustained only by the power of the Spirit, and God spoke unto man, as one spirit to another, in clear speech. Indeed, the religion of Israel, as is well known, was peculiarly hostile to all forms of sorcery and soothsaying, upon which the prophets, even from Moses onward, failed not to pronounce over and over again severe denunciations (Ex. xxii, 18; Deut. xviii, 10; Micah v, 12, etc.). They were sins which could be classed only with the worst. The noxious weed must be exterminated, for if allowed to flourish, true prophecy, which was essential to a true divine revelation, would only be smothered. The instances mentioned in 1 Sam. x, 9-12 and xix, 24, of prophetic frenzy or stupor are not instances of true Biblical prophecy, and belong to the earlier and ruder stage of the prophetic order. And only to a Saul, and for a special reason, would Divine interpretation vouchsafe a true answer through the medium of a witch (1 Sam. xxviii, 7-20). The fact that Saul came at night, and that the woman put her life in her hand (ver. 21), shows that even in that dark day witchcraft was not safe in Israel. The Urim and Thummim was essentially different from any form of sacred lot known in heathenism. Here the answer was always an ex-

plicit direction in reference to a particular case, no further explanation being needed, and no mystic appliances or formulae in connection with it being resorted to. But even the Urim and Thummim belonged only to the lower periods of Israel's growth, passing away as the nation advanced to higher stages of moral and religious elevation. He who in the earlier days was called a "seer" was in the later days called a "prophet" (1 Sam. ix, 9); and "to be the mouth-piece, the spokesman, of Jehovah, was higher than to see visions of the future, however clear, whether of the armies of Israel, or the lost asses of Kish. The Urim and Thummim disappeared with Abiathar of the time of David (1 Sam. xxiii, 5-9).

Heathen mantism was a failure. It appealed largely to idle or selfish curiosity, and left the people no better than it found them. Hebrew prophecy was not a failure, and in its teachings left the world an everlasting treasure. Instead of appealing to idle or selfish curiosity, Hebrew prophecy was not infrequently in direct and dangerous antagonism with it. The prophet lost his head; the mantis knew how to drive a good bargain, and did it. The prophet spoke what he must and because he must. If his words bubbled up, it was not in frenzy or with foaming mouth, but only in the sense that the words of honest, and earnest, and entirely responsible and conscious thinkers and speakers, have done the same thing.

My heart was hot within me;

While I was musing the fire kindled;

Then spoke I with my tongue.—(Psa. xxxix, 3).

And Jeremiah: "If I say, I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name, then is

in mine heart as it were a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I am weary with forbearing (xx, 9). It was this that made the prophet's words "boil forth," and he received neither salary nor perquisites (Micah iii, 5-11; Ezek xxx, 10, 2, etc.).

Hebrew prophecy was in its passive form the reception of a revelation; in its active form it was interpretation, or the communication of the revelation to those for whom it was intended. And though God did at times employ the dream and the vision in transmitting his message to the prophet, it was neither the usual nor the higher mode, and it was not the dream and vision of the mantis. The visions of Isaiah, and Ezekiel, and Daniel, have no correspondence in heathen theology. Usually the prophet was in his ordinary waking physical condition, and in this condition was, by a direct Divine impulse to his thoughts, caused to think something which ordinarily he would not, or could not, have thought. This was his inspiration, or prophetic state. His mind was passive only in so far as he simply received the message instead of creating it; and when the message was given forth by him it bore with it the marks of his individuality.

The habitual state of the prophet was doubtless one of intense mental alertness (Hab. ii, 1, Ezek. xxxiii, 7, etc.); and this alertness was, indeed, an essential part of his receptive attitude, and constituted another essential difference between the prophet and the mantis. It was this condition of habitual mental alertness that rendered the man capable of becoming an inspired prophet; or, in other words, which became in him the basis on which the Holy Spirit could operate. Of course God could transform lifeless stones into proph-

ets, and only in this sense was it possible for him to constitute any man at random an inspired prophet; for not every man had the natural endowment or acquirements which were necessary at the outset as a substructure for the supernatural. What Isaiah was when "moved by the Holy Ghost," depended to some extent upon what Isaiah was when he was not so moved. Two men may have the same teacher and yet become very unequal scholars. Two may see the same objects, or read the same history, and yet draw from them very different lessons. The holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Divine Spirit, but they were moved in accordance with what they were before they were moved.

But they did not reach the subject matter of the heavenly message by any new process of reasoning; but from the message communicated to him the prophet might, by a process of reasoning, endeavor to deduce others; or, the reflective faculty being awakened, he might endeavor to understand the further import of what he had uttered. They did not, however, in every case at least, succeed. "And I heard, but I understood not," said Daniel; "Then said I, O, my Lord, what shall be the issue of these things? And he said, Go thy way, Daniel, for the words are shut up and sealed till the time of the end." (ch. xii, 8.) And Peter affirms of the prophets generally that they sought and searched diligently, "as miners search in the earth after precious metals, concerning what time and what historical circumstances the spirit of the pre-existing Messiah had reference to when he testified to them of the salvation which should come" (I Pet. 1, 10). The question, therefore, What did the prophet under-

stand by his message? is by no means identical with, What was the larger import in the mind of the spirit? And this last question it was not possible, in many cases, for either prophet or people to fully understand. In this respect also prophecy differed from mantism, for its duplicity was essentially different from the duplicity of the heathen oracle.

§3. Prophecy and the Natural Shemitic Genius.

As Hebrew prophecy is a wholly different thing from heathen mantism, so neither can it be regarded as the peculiar offspring of the peculiar Hebrew genius. There was nothing so peculiar in the Hebrew genius that it should have produced anything so peculiar as Hebrew prophecy. "No doubt," says Orelli, "a common spiritual inheritance is traceable among the Edomites, Arabians, Moabites, etc.; but whilst these tribes more and more blended the knowledge of God transmitted to them with heathenism, in Israel alone a converse with God was maintained, worthy of the majesty and condescension of the Supreme Spirit, and conducive to his further revelation. Of prophecy, there is little sign in these tribes. The 'wise men' are there the depositaries of the knowledge of God, inherited from antiquity, [and which became more and more a lost inheritance, until light was borrowed in after days from Israel]. Of a future plan of God they have nothing to tell." The inspiration of Mohammed is merely religious enthusiasm, and his language "is related to that of the prophets pretty much as the confused tirades of a spiritualistic medium, made up of motley reminiscences, and held together by mere pathos, are related to the works of the spirits

whom he professes to represent. Mohammed is, throughout, an *epigonus* of biblical literature, and what he has of national character in common with the prophets of the old covenant is too little to raise him to the height from which they bear their testimony through the Sovereign Spirit of God."

On the contrary, the natural tendency of the Hebrew was toward the religious level of the surrounding nations; and with this national religious tendency, prophecy was in perpetual antagonism. If prophecy be the product of natural evolution, it furnishes a remarkable instance of a people possessed of a persistent tendency to move in two opposite directions at the same time, the weakest tendency finally surviving. The differences in Hebrew prophecy, as compared with all forms of mantism and shamanism—the differences of content as compared with the religious literature of all ages and nations, its sublime heights of conception, its profound insight into the human heart and into the course of history, its wonderful unity, being the product of so many different ages and circumstances, its lofty moral elevation above the national trend, and, above all, its conformity to truth and fact, cannot be accounted for on any other hypothesis than that it is of God.

And yet there is a human element even in biblical prophecy. If not, then any Hamitic or Japhetic tribe that may be named might as well have been selected to be the covenant people of Jehovah as the Hebrews. But there must have been a national basis for the Divine choice. And comparative psychology finds such basis in the line of Shem. The religious faculty was their distinguishing faculty, as compared with

Hamites and Aryans. They were more adapted by nature than their equals or superiors in culture "to see the absolute in the finite, the workings of God in nature, his action in history, and to hear his words in the inner spiritual life of individuals." (Orelli.)

But there is not only an ethnological, but also an individual human element in prophecy. It was in Abraham, and so Abraham was chosen. It was in each of the prophets, and appears in their prophecies. The prophecies were the light transmitted through the prophets, and the light comes to us tinged with the individuality of the medium, but none the less divine. Amos was none the less Amos after he became a prophet; and precisely such a man as he was needed to transmit a certain light to Israel. If Divine lamentations over the desolation of Zion are to be communicated, there must be a Jeremiah for the purpose. God speaks to those who have ears to hear—ears for the particular message. The kingdom is of many phases, and many parables are needed to complete the list of likenesses.

§4. *The Predictive Element in Prophecy.*

A prophet, or *nabi*, was not one merely who foretold future events. Indeed, he may not have foretold at all, and yet have been a prophet. This was a mere accident of his office, though as a matter of fact it does abound in the recorded utterances of the Old Testament prophets. But a prophet was one who spoke for another a prescribed message, as his authorized agent or representative. The word, or message, may or may not have been a prediction. It was simply a revealed fact or truth, whether of permanent and general na-

ture, or one pertaining to the past, present or future. It may have been a fact or truth which the prophet knew simply by the exercise of his own natural faculties. It is true that the mass of the people was always more impressed, for the time being at least, by the miracles or predictions of the prophets than by their moral and spiritual ideas; and it is easy to be explained why, after the permanent withdrawal of the prophetic gift, still greater weight has been laid, by both Jews and Christians, upon the predictive elements of the prophecies which have been preserved. But it remains true that prediction was only one of the means whereby prophecy would accomplish its end.

Prophecy admitted that a knowledge of the future was desirable; but one of its chief functions was to enable the Israelitish nation to know the future only as a means to an end, and to know it in a certain way, which way alone would be pleasing to God and a blessing to man. It restricted its revelations of the future to matters of national interest and theocratic import. It was as different from fortune-telling as miracle was from mere wonder-working. Predictions held the same relative place in God's dealings with his Old Testament people that miracle held in the hand of Christ. He wrought no miracle merely for the sake of healing. The prophet foretold no event for the sake merely of furnishing the Israelitish public with the advance sheets of news. The miracles were obviously only incidents—suitable means to a far higher end. Prophecy employed predictions only where it was needful to do so, fulfilling its function only in part by the miracle of foreknowl-

edge, and in part by pointing the eyes of the nation backward to the holy and righteous government of God as manifested in their own history, and to the aims of Divine providence as exhibited in that history.

The object thus sought was to qualify the people to anticipate and thereby avoid possible judgment, to walk conscious of and ever mindful of their own mission as the chosen people, and of the great future which this involved, even regarding it as beneath their dignity to be dependent upon any form of soothsaying. They already knew *their* future; they did not, like the heathen, need to be informed by any undignified and precarious means; and the predictions of the prophets were to be regarded rather as of the nature of reminders. "Therefore thou hast forsaken thy people, the house of Jacob, because . . . they are soothsayers like the Philistines." (Isa. ii, 6). The resort for knowledge of the future must be either to soothsaying or to Jehovah, as teaching them in their own and in predictive prophecy. They could not resort to both. Therefore "I will cut off witchcraft out of thine hand; and thou shalt have no more soothsaying." (Mi. v, 12). Or, in other words, the office of prophecy was to promote and unfold the ways of the kingdom of God, and to this end it looked both backward and forward.

There is a form of rationalism which holds that the predictions of particular events, which also in many instances fell within the sphere of prophecy, is inadmissible on the ground of its destroying human freedom and thereby interfering with history. It affirms that if God knows an event as contingent, it cannot be

predicted as certain, and yet it is so predicted; therefore the prediction is not reliable. Or, history implies freedom, they say; but if the prophet predicts that Israel will, then Israel must; and hence there is no longer freedom, and hence no longer history, but only fatalism. But rather than reject the possibility of history, the rationalists of this school prefer to reject the possibility, or rather the reliability, of the predictive element in prophecy. But this view must be summarily rejected. For, in the first place, as Edersheim rightly says, predictive prophecy is "never absolute, but always subject to moral conditions." Predicted events are predicted as contingent, either impliedly or expressly (*Isa. vi, 9 ff*); they are not predicted as absolutely certain, but only as contingently so. And in the second place, the course of the world is not entirely, perhaps not even mainly, dependent on the arbitrary decision of the human will. God does not change his will; but he wills changes. He rules. And yet man is free. But the freedom of history is the freedom of God.

§ 5. *Characteristics of Prophecy.*

In addition to the characteristics of prophecy already discussed in the foregoing sections the following distinctive features of the prophetic literature in general may be here mentioned :

1. Its immediate practical character. While the contemporaries of the prophets did not see all the ends aimed at, nor know all the far-reaching significance of the prophetic utterances, they might nevertheless know very well all that was intended for them, and all that was essential to their welfare. Where the prophet

said, “Turn ye, turn ye, O house of Israel,” as he did say over and over again, in one way and another, the people could not be mistaken as to what that meant. And when he said “Retribution,” which also, in one phraseology or another, was one of the “burdens” of prophecy, they knew very well what that meant. They may not have understood all that it meant for some future generation, but they understood enough of what it meant for them. So, also, when the prophet uttered a message of promise, as he often did, it might be couched in enigmas, or symbols; but whether so or not, the people could always know that it meant something good, though they might not know all the details. They could distinguish the rainbow from the cloud, the promise from the threatened retribution, and know the relation in which they themselves stood to both. They needed not to know the particulars. The people, like the prophets themselves, needed rather always to be kept on the alert; and the only way to keep them on the alert was for them always to have in mind the wondering questions, What sort of good thing is it that is promised? What sort of evil thing is it that is threatened? By hope and apprehension should they be saved, both as a nation and as individuals,—just as we are.

2. Its intensely moral character. It is not merely “predicted history.” It is not merely “tidings about the future.” It is not misty speculations, and vagaries, and triflings, such as to a great extent characterized the religious literature of the heathen, or even the writings of the later Jews. “It had a present meaning and a present lesson to those who heard it,” and to those who should come after them. A prophet

could not have been a prophet had he not also been a preacher; and he looked both backward and forward in order that he might influence his own times, no less than future generations. The saying of the apostle, that "all scripture * * * is profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness" (II Tim. iii, 16), is applicable alike to the utterance of the prophets as addressed to their own times and as intended for the future. Its aim was largely ethical; it sought to enlist everything on the side of practical holiness. Its prediction, its retrospection, its warnings, its rebukes, its promises, all look to this end. It nowhere stops with the impartation of mere knowledge.

3. Its evangelical character. It went beyond the sphere of ethics. It is pervaded with truth adapted to human nature as fallen and guilty. It looks beyond morals to religion; beyond the sacerdotal to the spiritual; it spoke with such vehemence against the current ceremonialism, as to appear even to regard it as sinful (Amos v. 22 ff.; Hos. vi, 6; Micah vi, 6 ff., etc.) Though all the prophetic books do not possess this characteristic in an equal degree, it is nevertheless found in all. The Messianic idea in its broader or narrower sense, is everywhere present. It is this that gives them coherency; in this is found their "higher unity."

4. The time element. The future in prophecy often appears as immediately present,—predicted events or conditions being spoken of as now transpiring, or as already past. Balaam, who for the time being was a prophet of Jehovah, furnishes an illustration (Num. xxiv, 15-19); what he saw, his natural eye being closed, he saw as at that moment taking place. He

saw a star rising out of Jacob; a sceptre rising out of Israel, and smiting through the corners of Moab, and breaking down all the sons of tumult. Another instance is Isa. liii, where the events described are represented as being already completed. (See, also, Isa. v. 13; viii, 23; Jer. ii, 26; Ezek. iii, 25, etc). To such an extent does this usage occur that grammarians have called it the “prophetic” perfect, when that form of the verb is the one employed.

Here also is to be noted the subordinate importance which prophecy attaches to dates. In a few instances only is emphasis placed upon the exact time of fulfillment, as in Ezek. xii, 28; Dan. ix.; Isa. xvi, 14; xxi, 16. The chronological datum usually is simply “in that day,” or “in the last days.” Everyone knows with what frequency these indefinite expressions occur. In the short prophecy of Zechariah alone the latter phrase is found no less than fourteen times; one side of the picture of “that day,” or the last age, being a description as vivid, as intense and awful as the famous *Dies Iræ*, while the other is the wilderness and solitary place already made glad, and the desert blossoming with roses. The prophet’s horizon is the end of the age, or *hayyom hahu*, “which represents the termination of the course of spiritual development in the midst of which the prophet stands.” (Orelli). But between him and the farthest and highest peak on his horizon are lower peaks, and the prophet sees not the intervening valleys.

5. Grouping events. In lieu of definite chronological statement as to the exact time when an event shall take place, prophecy groups the events which it predicts according to their necessary chronological order.

A certain event shall transpire, and this shall be succeeded by another, and this again by another, the exact time when in no case being given. In its predictive element prophecy generally looks far ahead to the consummation of the kingdom of God, when his will shall be the accepted rule of all men. In other words, its ultimate object of vision is the fulfillment of God's purpose of salvation in the last days, its immediate object being salvation as a process, or "the way in which God conducts his purpose of salvation from the actual present to its fulfillment or appointed end." (Kurtz). Hence it looks to the past and to the present in order that it may look to the future, having need in its references to the latter, not of exact dates, but only of the order of succession. In prophetic vision we have first, *guilt*, then *retribution*, and lastly *redemption*, the dark cloud always being encircled with a rainbow. But the exact times of the retribution and redemption are not given. The *judgment* is first upon Israel, then upon the world. The deliverance is first from Assyria, or Babylon, or other world-power happening to be dominant at the time of the prophet's speaking, but which ere long becomes suggestive of deliverance under the Messianic reign; the near future being combined, or blended, in prophetic thought, with the far future; as the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the Jewish economy are combined in prophetic vision with the end of the world. This is what is sometimes called the perspective character of prophecy. The seer looked from hill-top to farther hill-top, nor did he in every case determine whether the object, or group of objects, was on a nearer hill-top or beyond; the far away ones would seem to be projected on the same

horizon—that unknown depth of prophetic background called “the last days.” The prophet knew that he saw the object, but he knew not exactly when. This characteristic belongs to New Testament prophecy no less than to Old. Paul knew that the Lord would come, and he knew that there would be a great apostasy, but he knew not how far off was either event. The fact was more important than the time when. But when prophecy becomes history, the far and the nearer may be distinguished.

6. Its dependence upon history. By history is here meant the outward experiences of Israel in the past and in the prophets' present. The same God who revealed to Israel lessons by prophecy also conducted the course of Israel's history; and he did the former in large part by means of the latter. If David had had no bitter experiences he could not have been, according to the Divine way of working, the inspired author of the Messianic twenty-second psalm. As prophecy was from the beginning “a preparation for Christ,” so was history a preparation for prophecy. The later brilliant predictions concerning the Messianic King and his Kingdom would not have been possible in the days when “there was no king in Israel.” The prophecies of Isaiah concerning the suffering Servant of Jehovah would have been an impossible anachronism in the days of Solomon.

Prophecy accommodated itself to the plane of the people who were primarily addressed. Its subject matter is couched in current terms. It receives coloring from the nation's past and from the circumstances of the prophets' present. Politics, geography and ethnology enlarged its sphere by bringing new and sug-

gestive experiences into Israel's history, and new nations within the range of the prophet's vision. The future kingdom of God (e. g.) is presented as an extended and glorified form of the theocracy, with which the prophet and people are familiar; and this seems to be at least one providential use which God made of the persistent desire of the people in Samuel's time to have a king and a kingdom (I Sam. viii, 1-22). The kingdom granted them became ever afterward a kind of object-lesson, or illustration. The king of the future kingdom of God was to be another David, who was the greatest of the kings of Israel (Isa. xxx, 9; Ezek. xxxvii, 24, 25; Hos. iii, 5, etc.) It was too soon yet to say, "The kingdom of God is within you." (Luke xvii, 21). The well-known temple is the material of the vision of Ezekiel (ch. xli, xlvi). The admission of other nations into the kingdom of God is represented as the nations traveling in an unbroken stream to Mount Zion (Isa. ii, 2; Micah iv, 1, 2). The world hostile to the kingdom of God is represented as the enemies of Israel—Moab, Edom, Assyria, or whichever one happened to be the dominant one at the prophet's time, or was regarded as the permanent and representative enemy. But did the prophet understand it all thus? Not perfectly. We read in the light of fulfillment and subsequent revelations. Facts were revealed to the prophets, but not always interpretations. The diction they employed in such cases, as above mentioned, was not conscious figure of speech. If Assyria was spoken of, Assyria was meant. The form of the mold into which the truth is cast, in order that the abstract may become concrete, and the spiritual become visible, is determined by the familiar historical sur-

roundings. While, therefore, the literal Israel or Assyria was meant, it was the mold into which another Israel or Assyria was cast, the nature of which even the prophet, to say nothing of the average Israelite, may not have clearly perceived. Nor is it strange that it should have been so. To speak to any age in the language of the future is to speak to it in an unknown tongue—and the prophets did not so entirely speak. The future to every age is to some extent the projection of the present. We describe heaven in the terms of earth. It is the place of “rest” because we are “weary” here. When the child sings of “the happy land, far, far away,” the child understands it, doubtless, in a literal sense; and the most that wiser ones can make of it is that it means something good.

And yet prophecy was not merely the interpreter of history; not the natural offspring of its past and present. History was only the wind that blew upon it, making its voice loud and soft, making it breathe threatenings of storm or promise of sunshine and blossoms. Prophecy was the work of God—and this the prophet knew.

7. The realization. The prophet sees the realization of the matter of prophecy in particular events which are complete in themselves; e. g.: In Joel iii, the outpouring of the Spirit on the people of God is presented in the prophetic intuition as a single act, which the prophet may have thought exhausted the prophecy; so also the judgment of the end of the world is presented as a single act of judgment, taking place in the valley of Jehosaphat. Whereas, the fulfillment is really a process of long and gradual development; the one outpouring, or

the one judgment, being only a link of the long unbroken chain, or grand culmination of a series of similar events. This has been called the law of dilation, though speaking of it with reference to the prophets' own point of view, it would be better called the law of visual compression. Many objects seen from far away appear to be compressed into one, but as we draw near to them, they appear as they really are, more than one.

8. Apparent contradiction. Another peculiarity of prophecy is the frequent apparent contradiction of the matter of one prophecy by that of another; e. g.: One prophet looks to the future and reports the Messiah as the Prince of Peace. Another reports him as a war-like hero. At one time he is a civil ruler, at another the Servant of Jehovah, atoning for the sins of the people. The fact is that prophecy recognizes, whether the prophet in every instance recognizes it or not, that before there can be peace there must be war; before the plowshare and the pruning-hook must be the sword and the spear. Before reconciliation there must be expiation. Prophecy looks at one time on this side, at another on that. It presents in these cases of apparent contradiction the particular as particular and not in its connections. But all the lines of vision converge to one and the same object, which, in the illustrative case taken, is the one Jesus of Nazareth. The Jewish interpreter, from the beginning, has stumbled here, because he did not detect the point of convergence.

§ 6. *Forms of Prophecy.*

It already follows from what has been said that we are to seek the fulfillment of predictive prophecy under

the limitations of the form in which it may be presented. That which the prophet said literally is not in every instance that which the prophet meant; and hence it often becomes necessary to distinguish carefully the substance from the type, or form, employed to convey it to us. Failure to do this identifies prophecy with history, destroys, in many instances, the possibility of fulfillment and reduces prophecy, in its predictive aspect especially, to a mere "compound of truth and error, of blasted hopes and disappointed expectations." The following, beginning with the lowest, are the gradations of the forms of predictive prophecy, recognized by all writers between the extremes of Montanism on the one hand, and Rationalism on the other *

1. *The rudest material symbols.* As examples see the rent garment of Ahijah the Shelonite (I Kings xi, 30, 31); the two staves of Zechariah (Zeck. xi, 7). Instances are numerous, the symbolism, of course, being too evident to be mistaken by anyone.

2. *Types.* "By type," says Orelli, "we understand the inadequate presentation of a divine idea which is to be more perfectly realized afterwards. The spirit of God not only reveals himself in definite words which he suggests to consecrated seers. He also rules in history, shaping it with significant reference to the future." Types are either—

* The rationalistic theory of prophecy, viz., that it was, at the most, only the wise guessing of astute discerners of the signs of the times, can hold its own only against the Montanistic theory, which, failing to distinguish between form and substance, sought literal and detailed fulfillment. See Brigg's *Messianic Prophecy*, pgs. 48 seq.

- (1) *Archæological*, as the ritualistic system of Moses; or,
- (2) *Historical*, as the exodus of Israel from Egypt and the destruction of their enemies; or,
- (3) *Personal* types, as Moses, David, Solomon, each of whom illustrated in his office or life one or more aspects of the personal Messiah.

The essential difference between the type and verbal prophecy consists in the fact that in the latter there was a *recognized* reference to the future, while in the former there was not. The contemporaries of Moses did not see Christ in Moses nor in the ritual; if they had, they would not have needed the ritual. Types were makeshifts, temporary expedients, substitutes for the thing itself. In no case is there an exact correspondence between the type and the future reality. The point to be guarded against with this form of prophecy is to avoid mistaking a mere *fanciful* for a divinely *designed* resemblance. Only by knowing the antetype as it appears in the fulfillment, can we know the type. The New Testament lies hid in the Old, but not in the wholesale and yet one-sided sense which many of the early fathers supposed.

3. *Typico-prophetic-form*. Psa. lxxx, 8–15, is a striking instance, as also Micah iv, Isa. ii, Dan. ii and Ezek. xl ff. Under this head fall also prophetic parables and tales, as Psa. xlvi, and the song of Solomon, and extravagant descriptions apparently of one's experience (Psa. xxii). The attempt, on the one hand, to interpret this class of prophecies rigidly, and find their exact fulfillment in history must fail, and bring predictive prophecy into disrepute; while on the other hand to ignore the type element in them is to deny the possibility

of prediction, for manifestly some of these prophecies were never fulfilled in any such sense. Examples: Jer. xxxiii, 7; Ezek. xi, 15-18; Zech. x, 6; Isa. xi, 13, etc.

CHAPTER III.

DOCTRINAL CONTENTS OF DAVIDIC PROPHECY.

A. THE PREDICTIVE, OR OBJECTIVE, ELEMENT.

The Central Thought.

The central and controlling thought of the Davidic predictive prophecy is of the Messiah and his kingdom. Israel, now as formerly, looked forward, not backward, to its golden days; and now, as before and after, prediction took its verbal form and expression from the current inward and outward circumstances of the people. And yet as we have seen, it was ever an essential characteristic of prophecy to be larger than the immediate fulfillment—larger, perhaps, than the immediate hope of either prophet or people.

The first faint gleams of the dawn of Davidic prophecy appear in I Sam. ii, 1-10 and 35, 36. In the first, Hannah, whom God had caused to be the mother of Samuel, and in view of her recent devotion of the child to God, rises in prophetic praise to the conception of Jehovah as the universal and all-wise One who judgeth the ends of the earth, in order to give strength to his

king, in order to exalt the horns of his anointed. As yet there was no king in Israel; and yet it is Israel's king whom Jehovah will strengthen and exalt through judgment upon all his enemies. The human basis of the prophecy is the longing of the nation for a king, which on account of the unsettled condition of the people, was already beginning to manifest itself; and hence the distinct reference to a king of Israel here can be regarded as neither unnatural nor unhistorical. The prophecy found its first great fulfillment in David and his prosperous kingdom, and yet still more conspicuously in David's greater Son, of the enduring order and unfading prosperity of whose reign that of the former was but the temporal shadow. In verses 35, 36 it is predicted that in the place of the unfaithful and degenerate house of Eli a faithful priesthood should be raised up which should minister before this anointed king forever. In this instance, also, it is the evil of the present that inclines and enables the prophetic eye to look only the more keenly to the future. And yet the darkness continued for long years after Samuel's birth, the times growing worse rather than better. But it was known from Dan even unto Beersheba that Samuel was established to be a prophet of Jehovah (I Sam. iii, 20). So there was hope.

These two prophecies became well known in Israel, and were doubtless often pondered by King David, who may have seen in himself a fulfillment of the first, and derived from the second his first suggestion to re-organize the priesthood and establish the worship of Jehovah in perfect form on Zion. The house of Eli was displaced for ever, and the restored priesthood henceforth shared its functions with prophecy.

§1. The Covenant with David.

Jerusalem had been taken by David from the enemies of Israel, and made the seat of his kingdom. He is secure in his sovereignty, and dwells in peace in his house of cedar on Zion. And now he desires to build Jehovah a house, which shall be the permanent center of the restored and reorganized national worship; and his heart is filled, perhaps, with memories of the prophecies of Hannah and Samuel. This is the immediate occasion, on David's part, of the promise which Jehovah now makes to him. The two versions are in II Sam. vii, and I Chron. xvii. The first is as follows:

- 1 And it came to pass, when the king dwelt in his house,
2 and the Lord had given him rest from all his enemies round
3 about, that the king said unto Nathan, the prophet, See
4 now, I dwell in an house of cedar, but the ark of God
5 dwelleth within curtains. And Nathan said to the king, Go,
6 do all that is within thine heart, for the Lord is with thee.
7 And it came to pass the same night that the word of the
8 Lord came unto Nathan, saying, Go and tell my servant
9 David, Thus saith the Lord, Shalt thou build me an house
10 for me to dwell in? For I have not dwelt in an house since
the day that I brought up the children of Israel out of
Egypt, even to this day, but have walked in a tent and in a
tabernacle. In all places wherein I have walked with all
the children of Israel, spake I a word with any of the tribes
of Israel, whom I commanded to feed my people Israel, say-
ing, Why have ye not built me an house of cedar? Now
therefore, thus shalt thou say unto my servant David, Thus
saith the Lord of hosts, I took thee from the sheepcote, from
following the sheep, that thou shouldst be ruler over my
people, over Israel. And I have been with thee whitherso-
ever thou wentest, and have cut off all thine enemies from
before thee, and will make thee a great name, like unto the
name of the great ones that are in the earth. And I will ap-
point a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that
they may dwell in their own place, and be moved no more;

- neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any
11 more, *as at the first*; and as from the day that I commanded
judges to be over my people Israel; and will cause thee to rest
from all thine enemies. Moreover, the Lord telleth thee
that he the Lord, will make thee an house.
- 12 When thy days shall be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with
thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall
proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom.
- 13 He shall build an house for my name, and I will establish
14 the throne of his kingdom for ever. I will be his father, and
he shall be my son; if he commit iniquity I will chasten him
with the rod of men, ~~and~~ with the stripes of the children of
15 men; but my mercy shall not depart from him, as I took it
16 from Saul, whom I put away before thee. And thine house
and thy kingdom shall be made sure for ever before thee; thy
17 throne shall be established for ever. According to all these
words, and according to all this vision, so did Nathan speak
unto David.

Here begins a new stage of development, and a well-defined advance in revelation on the part of God, and knowledge and culture on the part of the people.

1. At first David had been chosen only for himself to be king, in God's place, over Israel. As had been the case with Saul before him, he had not known hitherto but that both king and kingdom would cease with himself. But here a promise is given to him which includes his posterity, and a hereditary monarchy is established. The people of God have a law and land, a permanent prophethood, a monarchy, and a local center of worship, where Jehovah is recognized as dwelling; the organization is completed, and all that remains is to develop, refine and advance in spiritual growth.

2. Formerly Israel as a whole had been recognized as Jehovah's son (Ex. iv, 22; Deut. xxxii, 6), one in whom Jehovah had proprietary right, and whose service to Him should be priestly and holy. But now

David's seed stands to him in that relation. "I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son." Jehovah would build David a royal house, which house in turn should be his temple-builder. The relation between them should never be severed. But sin on the part of the son, or seed, should be followed by chastisement.

3. The promise looked beyond David, beyond any one or all of David's sons who succeeded him on the literal throne. It is generic; it included David himself and each one and all his royal sons; the dynasty of David should reign for ever, finding at last in Jesus Christ an eternal throne. For it was implied that there should be in the future *One* person who should fulfill all the requirements of the promise, and that he should be of the line of David.

4. It was never forgotten. It became not merely a tradition, but a part of the permanent literature of Israel. It became the historic basis of subsequent Messianic promises, even as it is the capstone of all former ones. Henceforth it is the ground of appeal, and the substance of prophecy. There was nothing greater than the "sure mercies of David" (Isa. Iv, 3), the raising up of the tabernacle of David (Amos ix, 11), the raising unto David a righteous Branch (Jer. xxiii, 5), to be again the subjects of David (Hos. iii, 5)—were the substance of all blessings which the people could ever long for—and such expressions as these show how the prophecy of Nathan affected the subsequent thought of Israel.

David's prayer of thanksgiving, which immediately followed the revelation to him of the good news (ver. 18-29), and the Psalm recorded in II Sam. xxiii (es-

pecially verse 5) show its influence upon himself. Notwithstanding the imperfections of his own house, the covenant was an everlasting one, arranged in all things and sure. There would be a Righteous One, who would rule over men; who would rule in the fear of God; who would be as the light of the cloudless morning, when the sun riseth, when the tender grass springeth out of the earth through clear shining after rain. Such, according to the writer of Second Samuel, was the theme of David's meditations.

The glory of this covenant with David is richly unfolded in a second prophetic message to him, contained in Psalm cx.* This Psalm represents Jehovah as addressing David's Son, who goes forth from Zion as a conquering king, at the head of an army of youthful volunteers, vast in number, fresh as the dew of the morning, and clothed in beautiful garments. He is also represented as a priest, not after the order of Aaron, but after the manner of Melchizedec—priest in his own right, royal priest, in whom both functions of royalty and priesthood should be eternal. Here for the first time it is predicted that the two should be united in one person.

In Psa. ii, we have another Davidic prediction, also an inspired echo of the prophecy of Nathan. Here the Son of David is the Son of God, and his dominion is not merely over Israel, but over the world. Here not the reigning *house* of I Sam. vii, but the reigning *Son* sits at the right hand of Jehovah, laughing in divine scorn at the consultations of his enemies against him,

*The Psalm is undoubtedly Davidic (belonging to the time of David), and whether actually written by him or not, its sentiment was indorsed by him (Matt. xxii, 41-46; Mark xii, 35-37).

whose subjugation is inevitable. The divine decree is announced by the Son, which entitles him to all the prerogatives of sovereignty, and they are declared blessed who, "instead of proudly building on their own counsel, and on fleshy power, seek their strength and refuge in the Lord," the greatest benefit of the world being the rule of God and his Anointed, against whom it strives.

§2. *The Messiah in the Typical and Typico-prophetic Psalms.*

In addition to the Psalms which were directly prophetic of the Messiah, many others are either typical or typico-prophetic. A psalm is said to be typical when the experiences which it describes in the life of the psalmist are so fashioned as to be made to correspond to certain features of the life of the Messiah. A typico-prophetic psalm is one in which the experience is so described as to render it unreasonable exaggeration if restricted wholly to the life of the psalmist himself. It is by no means easy in many instances to distinguish between the typical and typico-prophetic psalms, nor are all interpreters agreed that there is any such thing as a directly prophetic psalm. To say, however, that there is a basis in the character or experience of the psalmist for his utterances, is by no means the same as denying that there is in them an inspired predictive element; so that it matters little whether we call a given psalm *directly prophetic*, or simply typico-prophetic. These psalms may be here grouped in the following classes:

1. *The Regal Psalms.* Psa. ii and cx have been considered. Other illustrations are xx, xxi, xxiv, lxxii, etc.

Psalm xx is an invocation on behalf of the king, who, it seems, was about to go forth to battle (See II Sam. x). The king speaks of himself in the third person, being intended, perhaps, to be offered by others than the king himself, in the public sanctuary. Its prophetic aspect consists in the fact that David as king was a designed representative of King Messiah, in whom Davidic sovereignty over the kingdom of God should be continued for ever. David recognized himself in this relation, and hence his wars were holy wars.

The most probable and natural view of Psa. xxi regards it as a thanksgiving paean, composed and sung in gratitude for victory vouchsafed to the king over his enemies, in answer to prayer offered in Psa. xx (see II Sam. xii, 30). It is Messianic for the same reason, and in the same sense as the latter. In verse 8 Jehovah addresses the king, promising him the final and utter destruction of his enemies. "They shall be consumed as dry straw in the flame of his wrathfulness, for they intended evil against him; they imagined a mischievous device, which they cannot perform" (see Psa. ii). The second half of the Psalm is, therefore, more prominently prophetic, and will yet find its highest fulfillment in the destruction of all his foes. The wars and triumphs of David were theocratic, and not merely personal, and were, therefore, the then present form of the church's wars and triumphs, and typical of its future.

Psalm xxiv is a grand choral hymn, composed and sung, most probably, on the occasion of the removal of the ark to the city of David, on Mount Zion, as described in II Sam. vi, a day of solemn gladness and

triumph. It is prophetic, or at least typical, in its character, and celebrates the return of Christ, the King of Glory, to his heavenly throne. It shall be fully accomplished in the latter days, when all nations shall be Israel, and “the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.” (Isa. ii, 2). “The doors of all hearts, all temples and all kingdoms shall be thrown wide before him; when he shall be acknowledged upon earth as he is acknowledged in heaven.”—*Perowne*.

Psalm xlv represents the Messiah as the Royal Bridegroom. It is not an allegory, but is founded on an actual occurrence which took place in Israelitish history—most probably the marriage of King Solomon, for it evidently belongs to the most prosperous period of the history of Israel. The glories of the bridegroom, and the splendors and joys of the marriage, are the mirror in which the psalmist sees the close and affectionate relation in which King Messiah stands to his people, who are not only Israel, but all nations. The Psalm presupposes that the Davidic wars of subjection are over, and the sword and the spear have been converted into implements of peace. This same relation of the Messiah-King to his people is presented in the Canticle form, not of a Psalm, but of a more extended dramatic idyl, which could scarcely have been better suggested by any period of Israelitish history than the peaceful and joyous and sinless days of Solomon’s earliest reign. The Oriental mind was not unaccustomed to the presentation of spiritual truth and sentiment under this nuptial imagery. At various periods of Old Testament

history God speaks of himself, through the prophets, as the Bridegroom of his people as a whole (not of an individual; Isa. liv, 5; lxii, 5; Jer. iii, 1; Ezek. xvi, 8; etc.) And in the New Testament Christ speaks of himself as the Bridegroom, and of the Church as a bride, and likens the kingdom of God, in certain of its aspects, to a marriage feast (Matt. xxi, 1f; xxv; ix, 15; Eph. v, 32; II Cor. xi, 2; Rev. xix, 7; xxi, 2).

In Psalm lxxii the peaceful Solomon is about to succeed the warrior David, and here we have a prayer in his behalf, and a prophetic description of his peaceful and prosperous reign, and in such terms as could find their fulfillment only in David's other and greater Son. The King Messiah and his kingdom, as presented in the Old Testament, are like the "kingdom of heaven," in the New Testament, which needs many parables, in order that it may be presented in many aspects, present and future. So in the Old, many parables, or types, or illustrations are needed to show forth the King Messiah in his many sidedness, to say nothing of the same Messiah as Prophet and Priest.

2. *The Passion Psalms.* But the Messiah in the Psalms is not only a King; he is also a Sufferer. "As David rose to glory only through the heaviest persecutions, and was forced through his eventful life to drink the cup of affliction to the dregs," so also did it behoove the Messiah, in his several-fold character, to be "made perfect through suffering." The psalmist's own bitter experiences become the natural basis of inspired descriptions of experiences yet more bitter, and which find adequate fulfillment only in the humiliations and sufferings of the Man of Sorrows. If the inspired psalmists, whether kings or prophets, had

never suffered, they, perhaps, would never have seen the suffering side of the life of Him who was to come. They could get glimpses into the mystery of his suffering only by viewing it through experiences of their own.

(1.) Psalm lxix is a striking illustration of this class of Psalms. Here is intense mockery, shame, poverty, sorrowfulness on the part of the innocent sufferer. He is hated, despised, maltreated without cause; or, rather, because of his fidelity to God and zeal for his house (ver. 7, 9). And yet he is abandoned by God to his enemies. They persecute him only more and more. But at last the reward comes; his enemies incur their doom, and the song of deliverance is sung in the great congregation, and heaven and earth are called upon to praise him. Regarding the Psalm as not merely typical, but as typico-prophetic, it is as applicable to David as it is to Jeremiah or any other suffering prophet; there being no reason why exact correspondence should be sought in the life of anyone. It is not only history, or fact; it is also poetry; and hence it might have been the inspired product of anyone of sufficient poetic genius, who though not a sufferer himself, was a witness to suffering in the life of others.

(2.) But while the holy sufferer was, as such, a representative of him who was despised and rejected of men, he was not in all respects a representative, and hence a given Psalm may not in all respects be either typical or prophetic. Psalm xl, 12, is an illustration of the exception as to details which must sometimes be made. While the Psalm as a whole is closely parallel to Psa. lxix, verse 12 cannot be regarded as having a typical or prophetic reference to Jesus of Nazareth, un-

less, indeed, it be in the sense that he made our iniquities his own; or in other words, in the sense that the iniquities which were his, not actually, but by adoption, took hold upon him.

(3.) But in Psa. xxii we have the most evident and interesting illustration of this class of Psalms. Here we have suffering heaped upon suffering, the intensely anguished soul breaking forth at the very outset with a cry of unutterable loneliness and despair; and yet closing (verse 22ff) with expressions of hope and exultation, as if the rainbow were visible even here in the midst of the fierce storm; and as if out of his very sufferings should come the recognition of him among the peoples not yet born.

It matters little if no exact parallel to the experience depicted in the Psalm is found in David's life; nor in order that we may attribute the Psalm to him is it necessary for us to suppose that he was here summing up the bitter experiences of a lifetime. David might well have written it. He had known enough of suffering, both by observation and experience, to form a natural basis for the Psalm; and, to say nothing of his inspiration, it better suits the style of his exalted and yet sensitive and intense poetic genius than that of any other poet in Israel. The sufferings depicted in the Psalm are ideal sufferings; they look beyond the bitter experiences of all kings and prophets, and find actual realization only in the sufferings of Jesus, the despised Nazarene.

(4.) Other Passion Psalms which may be studied in this connection are iii, vi, vii, xii, liv, lvi, lvii, etc., in all of which Messianic suffering, with varying intensity, is depicted. In one the sufferer flees from his

own people, who refuse to have him as their King; in another he feels sensible of his weakness, his soul is sore vexed, and he is weary with groaning; in another he prays to be delivered from his persecutors, lest they tear his soul like a lion, rending it in pieces; in another his enemies hide themselves, marking his steps, lying in wait for him. The object, however, of the Messianic suffering is not stated in these Psalms, the suffering being represented only as caused by the opposition and persecution of a wicked world.

3. *The Ideal Man.* There are two Psalms, conspicuously, in which the Messiah as the ideal man is presented. He is not divine, nor a king, nor a suffering prophet or priest. He is the perfect Man, who in his humility is a little lower than the divine ones (Psa. viii), in whom the human race finds its ideal self, forfeited and lost by the fall of the first. In finding this it shall find its original endowment of dominion. We may see in the Psalm, doubtless, a reminiscence on the part of the writer of the Mosaic account of the origin of the first man, who was created so nearly divine as to be in the image and likeness of God, and to whom was granted universal dominion.

Psalm xvi is the utterance of one who recognizes that he has no good beyond Jehovah, of one who has set Jehovah before him always. "The whole Psalm is bright with the utterance of a happiness which nothing can touch," and who recognizes himself already as triumphant in death. The Psalmist thinks of a resurrection in verses 9, 10, and of a blessed experience of communion with God after death. Peter, in Acts ii,

30, 31, distinctly affirms that these verses were consciously spoken by the Psalmist of Christ. He is the One in whom, as in Psalm viii, the lot and destiny of the perfect man is first realized.

B. THE MEDIATIVE, OR SUBJECTIVE ELEMENT.

Characteristic.

Here prophecy loses its predictive element. It is no longer a hope, or something looked forward to as pertaining to the Messianic King and kingdom. It is a present possession which engages the writer's thought, either an inheritance from former ages, or a fresh contemplation of divine things, awakened by the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit. It is embodied, for the most part, in the books of Job, Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, some of the Psalms, and the Song of Songs. It is commonly called the Hebrew Wisdom, and is the reflection of a divine light upon the great subjects which have to a greater or less extent engaged the thoughts of men of all ages. It corresponds, therefore, somewhat to the speculative and practical theodicy and ethics of other nations. The books of this class, particularly Job and Ecclesiastes, may seem to the casual reader hard to understand, but the fact that they are in the Bible makes it a complete book, and it ought to be regarded as one evidence that the Bible is the Book of God. Had they been absent, man, as he stands in the presence of many perplexing mysteries, might have felt that his natural and longing inquiries are not only left unanswered, but that they

even were ignored. This fact will probably appear more evident as we advance in our studies.

§1. *The Davidic Theology. (Doctrine of God.)*

Nothing could be purer, more exalted and vivid than the conception of the Divine Being and his various perfections, as presented in the literature of this period; though here, as elsewhere, it is necessary to distinguish between the inspired teaching and the view held by the average uninspired Israelite. Samuel, the mightiest spirit of his age, and one of the mightiest of any age, introduced a wholly new era in Hebrew thought and civilization, and his impress is ever afterward visible in the didactic and ethical sphere no less than in the strictly prophetic. Everything subsequent to him was, on its natural side, an outgrowth from him. Whether they ever attended his schools or not, David and Nathan were his pupils. It was what he said and did that made the latter possible. And yet both he and they were already in advance of the mass of their contemporaries. From the time of Samuel until the middle years of Solomon there is little sign of polytheistic tendency or idolatrous practice in Israel; but the very fact that even Solomon should have introduced again the worship of false gods, is a proof that notwithstanding the exalted monotheism of the psalms of this period, monotheism was not yet the exclusive and deeply rooted faith of Israel. How Solomon, or even the first Jeroboam, could have read these Psalms, after having them sung, perhaps, in the temple-service, and yet endanger the very life of the nation by introducing the worship of other gods, can be explained only by saying, Great is the power of sin. Even that part of the

Psalms which belongs to the Davidic period, and with which Solomon was well acquainted, if not in part the composer, presents God as the only God, and testifies directly or indirectly against every form of idolatry and the inward vanity of earthly comfort and prosperity, to which Solomon seems to have fallen so lamentable a victim. It glows with testimonials to the power of God, and his providence, his love and faithfulness, his holiness and righteousness. The following points may be more specifically noticed:

1. *The Names of the Divine Being.* The Davidic Psalms are for the most part Jehovahistic, the name Jehovah being by far the most usual name by which the Divine Being is addressed or spoken of. But the fact that the name Elohim, or God, also occurs in many of these Psalms, shows that the two names might often be safely used interchangeably, especially in as much as Jehovah was fast coming to be recognized as the only God. Especially, however, would we expect to find the name Jehovah wherever the Psalmist wished to speak to or of the Divine Being as One who stands in covenant and loving relation to Israel--just as we would often prefer the name *Father*, rather than the name *God*. At any rate, in no case in these or in any of the Psalms is the use of the name Elohim to be referred to the supposed incipient and growing superstition which afterward prevented the Jews from using the name Jehovah at all. The truth is, that as Israel became more and more a rigidly monotheistic people, the two names would become more and more nearly identical in significance; and as the name Elohim ceased to be associated with heathen gods, it might be a matter of individual habit or taste as to which of the

two a writer would use. But the Davidic Psalmist loves the old Mosaic memorial name, Jehovah, the God of Israel, as distinguished from the elohim of the adjacent heathen, with whom Israel, in those days, was in such fierce contention.

But it is during this period that the new name, Jehovah-Sabbaoth (Lord of Hosts), is introduced. It occurs for the first time in I Sam. i, 3, and thereafter many times, being a favorite title with the prophet. The term host (whether singular or plural) is sometimes used to designate the angels, sometimes the stars, and also the host or armies of Israel; but as a name of the Divine Being, it designates him, not as the one who rules the stars, or is able to command legions of angels to do his bidding, or as leading the armies of Israel; it designates him rather as one who is a host in himself. It is the name Jehovah incorporating into itself the name Elohim, thereby emphasizing the fact wherever the name is used, that Jehovah is not merely the faithful covenant God of Israel, but that he also possesses almighty power over the whole universe, whether animate or inanimate, rational or irrational. The historical basis of the title, however, is doubtless to be found in the fact that Israel, from the beginning of their history in Canaan, recognized Jehovah as being the leader of their host in battle, and the one who gained for them victory over their enemies. War was a large part of their occupation; and Jehovah, their God, was a God of war.

2. *The Divine Relation to the World.* The Psalms emphasize the relation of God, not only to Israel, but to the world, as exhibited in both general and special providences. This, indeed, is largely the theme of the

psalter as a whole, as it is of the hymnody of the later church. There is nothing in the Psalms akin to the Epicurean theodicy, which places God wholly apart from the world; nor with Pantheism, in any of its forms, which identifies God with the world. God is not aloof from nature; and he is not nature, nor is nature he. He rules over nature and in nature, the Psalms teach; and yet there is no machinery, no system of second causes mentioned or referred to. God is ever in the foreground. He created all things; he upholds all things; his watchful care is ever over all things, and he guides all things to the accomplishment of his will. In his relation to the church, "He that keepeth Israel will neither slumber nor sleep;" and as for the individual man who lives in loving allegiance to him, Jehovah is his Shepherd, he does not want; Jehovah guides him, delivers him, and protects him against all his enemies. As the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so is Jehovah round about them that fear him.

But he is also presented in the relation of Judge, particularly in the Psalms of David's singer, Asaph; a righteous Judge, exercising judgment for his own glory, both in Israel and among the nations. In the defense and deliverance of his people he comes in the judgment of devouring flame.

The doctrine of Divine providence, in its broadest and narrowest senses, finds its clearest and highest expression in the theology of the Psalms—as, indeed, we might easily expect it to do; for it appeals most nearly of all doctrines, perhaps, to the heart of man, especially the Hebrew heart, and finds readiest expression in poetry. And yet there were mysteries and harrowing

doubts afloat in the thought even of the Davidic age, as we shall see in a subsequent section. The masses of the people were not inspired, and those who were, were not vouchsafed inspired answers to all problems.

3. *Personal Attributes.* The holiness of God is also emphasized (I Sam. ii, 2; vi, 20; Psa. v, 4; xxii, 3, etc.); his justice (Job viii, 3; xxiii, 6; Psa. ix, 4; xi, 7, etc.); and his love as exhibited in goodness, mercy, long-suffering (Psa. xxv, 8; lxxxvi, 5, etc.)

4. *The Divine Spirit.* In the theology of this period, as in the Mosaic, the Spirit of God is the universal basis of life. Thou sendest forth thy Spirit and they are created, and thou renewest the face of the ground (Psa. civ, 30), the result of the withdrawal of the Spirit being death (ver. 29). So also does the spirit, or life, in man have as its originating activity the Spirit of God; the former being not an emanation of the latter, not in any sense identical with it, but caused by it (Ecel. xii, 7; Job xxxiv, 14; Psa. civ 29). The Spirit of God is “the original source to which every endowment of man’s physical, mental and moral life is referred.” The Spirit of God is also divine, in the sense of being God, but is not explicitly so identified until a later period (Ezek. iii, 24–27); but he is a personality, possessing divine attributes, as omnipresence (Psa. cxxxix, 7); goodness (Psa. cxl, 10); holiness (Psa. li, 11). But the Divine spirit is not understood here, or elsewhere in the Old Testament, as the Holy Spirit of the New Testament—the trinitarian second Person of the Godhead. And yet the Spirit of God is everywhere the Holy Spirit, except where it is an evident periphrasis for God himself.

§2. *The Davidic Doctrine Concerning the Moral and Ceremonial Law.*

The law, so far as here considered, is to be regarded under two aspects, the moral and ceremonial.

1. *The Moral Law.* We are obliged to suppose that David, and the other writers of this period, were acquainted with the moral and ceremonial laws, as set forth in the Pentateuch. The allusions to them are too numerous and direct to be accounted for on any other hypothesis. To say, in order to avoid this conclusion, that all the Psalms and other writings containing these references were written during the time of King Josiah, or even after the Babylonian exile, is to say that of which there is far from being any adequate proof. To say that both the system of law and the Psalm literature were the production of a comparatively late period of Israel's history, is to place upon this period a burden of intellectual activity too grievous to be borne, besides presupposing an unwarrantable degree of intellectual idleness on the part of the former ages. To justify this a more conclusive literary evidence than has hitherto been adduced is needed.

The second half of Psalm xix abounds in praises of the law. Psa. cxix, whatever may be its date, is only an elaborate expansion of the second half of the other Psalm. And with such testimony to the law the whole Psalter is pervaded (Psa. xxv, 10; xxxviii, 31; l, 16, lxxviii, 1, 5; etc.) The man on whom the highest blessedness is pronounced is the man who delights in the law of Jehovah, and meditates in it day and night. And yet the Psalmists and the Apostle Paul are in harmony, for Paul was by no means an Anti-

nomian. He, too, delighted in the law after the inner man (Rom. vii, 12, 22), and regarded it as holy, just and good. But Paul and the Psalmists regarded the law from two different points of view. "David does not speak of the law as opposed to the gospel, but of the law as including the promise [or gospel]. To him, the law is not merely the code, the bare precepts, but the whole revelation of God, so far as it was then given, including Christ himself, on whom the adoption of Israel rested. St. Paul, on the other hand, had to do with perverse interpreters of the law, who were for separating it from the grace and spirit of Christ; whereas, apart from Christ, the law, inexorable in its requirements, can only expose the whole world to God's wrath and curse."* To the Psalmist the law was simply the reflection of the pure and perfect and holy will of God, to which his heart and conscience consented, but of the true spiritual meaning of which the gospel has undoubtedly given us a deeper view than the majority, at least, of the Old Testament people had.

2. *The Ceremonial Law.* The attitude of the Psalmist toward the ceremonial law is not such as to indicate that he attached any importance to its outward observance, only in so far as such observance was the expression of an inward spiritual import. Of this spirit he does have a thorough appreciation. According to Samuel before him, the Lord had delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, but yet more in obedience to his voice (I Sam. xv, 22); and David himself says, under deepest sense of personal guilt, "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a con-

*Calvin, quoted by Perowne.

trite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." (Psa. li, 17); while in comparison with these, or apart from these, he delighted not in sacrifices and took no pleasure in burnt offerings.

See also Psa. 1, 8-14. The Psalmist recognizes that the law, in none of its aspects, can so effectually guide and supplement his own exertions as to preserve him from sin. He needs an inward cleansing and an additional and abiding grace from above, the grace of God's Holy Spirit (li, 2-12; xix, 12, 13). But this close and intimate union of the Spirit of God with his spirit would make his spirit both willing and steadfast, and able to discern the law in all its aspects as being no arbitrary rule of bondage, but rather "a charter and instrument of liberty"—a view entirely coincident with that of Paul.

The Psalmist, therefore, and the enlightened Israelites generally, evidently did not regard the sacrifices as having, in the case of those who offered them in penitence and faith, a spiritual efficacy—any more than there is in our own Christian water baptism, the recipient of which is a believing penitent. "Their only efficacy, as it seems to me," Perowne rightly says,* "was the efficacy which the law itself assigned to them;" they were the instruments of restoring him when he transgressed, to his place as a member of the theocracy, a citizen of the visible kingdom of God. But they did not confer, or convey, the *remission of sins*. They were *typical*, no doubt, of Christ's sacrifice; and the forgiveness which they procured, and which resulted in the re-admission of an offender to the privilege of his

Jewish citizenship, was typical of the forgiveness of sin under the gospel dispensation. But it is no less certain that the legal sacrifice did not take the place in the Old Testament of the sacrifice of Christ in the New, that it was not *through this legal sacrifice* that the Old Testament believer looked for the forgiveness of his sins. Had it been so, we could not have found the constant opposition between sacrifice and obedience, the studied depreciation of sacrifices, which meets us everywhere in the Psalms and the prophets, and which is, in fact, fully confirmed by the whole argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews. How far the Jewish believer saw into the typical meaning of his sacrifice, is a question which cannot now be answered. It is, however, somewhat remarkable that the prophets, earnestly as they expostulated with the people on the subject of their sacrifices, never say one word on this aspect of them, never speak of this their hidden meaning. But the typical meaning and the real efficacy are two very different things. “In truth . . . if we assign to the type the virtue of the antetype, if we make the remission of sins procured by the one co-extensive with the remission of sins procured by the other, we destroy the type altogether. The sacrifice had no moral value. Hence the Psalmist says, *not* sacrifice, but a broken heart. Could he have said this if through the sacrifice he looked for forgiveness of sin?” His hope of pardon was based on his sincere repentance, and the love of God, and his revealed and believed purpose of redemption (xxxii; cxxx). His plea was the Divine Name—the revelation of himself as a God of love and grace. “For thy name’s sake, O Lord, pardon me.”

(Psa. xxv, 11; xxxi, 3; etc.) And this revelation was afterward called Christ.

This emphasized attitude of the Psalmists toward the ceremonial law suggests what is expressly and repeatedly taught in regard to sin, viz: that it is not merely an affair of the outward life, but has its deep seat in the inward workings of the heart (Psa. xxxvi), and is to be ascribed primarily to man's innate conception (l, 5; lvm, 2, 3). It shows itself in deeds, in words, and in thoughts; nor is even the believer able to discern all its hidden and various ramifications (xiv; xvii, 3; cxli; cxxxix; etc.)

§3. *Retribution.*

The Psalms teach the doctrine of a righteous retribution, or recompense, to all men according to their deeds (Psa. xxxvii, 2ff). This recompense is dispensed mainly during the present life, yet not wholly; it is perpetuated to the children of the evil doers and of the righteous (xxv, 13; cix, 12; etc.) The doctrine of retribution after death is implied, rather than distinctly taught. In the imprecatory Psalms retribution is invoked upon the wicked (xxxv; cix), where David speaks, however, not in his private and personal capacity, but in his representative or Messianic character, as the king of God's kingdom in Israel, and whose enemies were God's enemies. His historical position, calling and situation rendered it as necessary and as justifiable in him to invoke retributive justice upon his enemies as it was for the Messiah himself actually to inflict it. It is as right for the typical Messiah to pray for victory which would result in the utter extermination of his enemies as it is for the actual Messiah to win such a

victory. As for the details of these prayers, they are only the form and color of the local circumstances and the peculiar cast of an oriental mind. In the Old Testament it is the judgment of God upon the enemies of his kingdom that stands in the foreground, whereas in the New it is rather his grace; but in the Old, as also finally in the New, it is supposed that the enemy is implacable; and hence, in order that the kingdom of God itself may not be overthrown, it is necessary that the prayer for just judgment should at last prevail over the prayer for mercy. The difference between the Old Testament and the New here referred to is not due to any essential difference of *spirit* in the two dispensations; *that* is the same in the one as in the other, longing always for the salvation of the enemies of God, their destruction being only a last resort. But in the Old Testament the circumstances of God's visible kingdom were already such that this resort to destruction, rather than mercy, was already the last resort. The Psalmist prayed through the medium of his own present, and there were not within the range of his horizon any enemies who recognized themselves as being in need of mercy, and hence they could not be its recipients; when the New Testament kingdom of God, which is only the continuation of the Old under another form, is assailed in like manner, *and by such* foes, the same prayer may well be offered again. And is it not already constantly offered? Surely it is; only the form in which the prayer is cast is changed, because in point of time and place we are living far from where the old prayer was offered. To translate into English is not identical with translating it into the nineteenth century and the Western hemisphere.

§4. *The Future Life.*

The literature of this period, particularly the Psalms and Ecclesiastes, is characterized by about the same relative number of allusions and the same definiteness of allusions to immortality and the future life, as the great body of ancient and modern Christian hymns. In neither the Old Testament nor the New are the details of the life hereafter given; and it was manifestly best that much should not be revealed. So, perhaps, was it impossible, in the very nature of the case, that much should be revealed. God could not reveal *himself* to man without causing to be used anthropomorphic and anthropopathic forms of expression; he used terms which literally were applicable only to man. But if he had revealed in more definite detail and explicitness than has been done, the future place, or the future *mode*, of existence, it would necessarily have been done in large part in terms of this life and of this world. And we can see plainly, that this would at least have had a tendency to encourage the wild and gross conceptions of heaven which characterize and deform the heathen theologies, and even the religion of Mohammed. The one born blind cannot distinguish colors, nor can he who was born deaf be caused to have any knowledge of musical sounds, nor can abstract definitions and descriptions convey to such a one any clear conception of these things.

But as man recognizes God, so does he also and for the same reason recognize a future. As God revealed himself to man, so also did he in that very revelation, whether natural or supernatural, reveal the fact of another world, which is future in respect to the

thought of any given living man, but is parallel to this one in respect to the continuous race. It was existing contemporaneously with Abraham, and when they departed from this world, they went thither. It was not *said* until Christ said it to the caviling Sadducees, that God "is the God of the living, and not of the dead;" but the *thought* had always been vaguely, if not definitely in the human mind. In revealing himself he revealed that other world where he is; and the Divine self-revelation brought God and the other world in recognized relation, not merely to the race or to Israel, but to the individual. It was not merely the collective, visible, organized people of God that lived for ever; but the entrance of God into relation with man, and the communion of man with God, was understood to imply his individual immortality.

And the fact that so little emphasis, apparently, is placed in the Old Testament Scriptures on this doctrine of individual immortality, in the sense of unending continuance of personal identity, is no evidence that it is not everywhere present in these Scriptures. It is the fundamental postulate, not only of the inspired hymns, as in the Psalms, and in the inspired speculations, as in Ecclesiastes, but of the whole Old Testament revelation. Without this essential basal postulate, it could not proceed. Without it, the Old Testament revelation is an enigma which admits of no solution, especially if we grant, to begin with, that it is supernatural, and not simply a history of a people's endeavor to grow, a striving to express its sense of the mystery of things.

In this view of the subject, it is apparent the personal religion, which finds undying expression especi-

ally in the Psalms, "is nourished by the spring of a firm hope of eternal life, and that that hope filled and cheered the hearts of God's people from the first ages of the church." There can be no religion where there is no belief in a personal immortality; and while the Old Testament writers, including the Psalmist and the Preacher, here and there give expression to what may seem to be shadowy doubts, they never give expression to anything that partakes of the nature of positive disbelief. Their religion would have forbidden it, even had they not been inspired. Such a passage as Psa. vi, 5, is no evidence to the contrary. "For in death there is no remembrance of thee; in sheol who shall give thee thanks?" is only a natural and emphatic way whereby the Psalmist would express his desire of present deliverance, and of praising God in this life, whatever might be true of the hereafter. So also of Psa. xxx, 9; lxxxviii, 10-12; Psa. lxxxix, 47, 48, is only an expression of the brevity of life and the certainty of death. Psalm cxv, 17, is the Psalmist's version of the thought expressed by our Saviour himself, when he said: "I work the work of him that sent me while it is day; for the night cometh when no man can work." (Jno ix, 4.) In this life is our opportunity—the one, at least, that deserves and must have present emphasis. Ecclesiastes ix, 5, contemplates, though gloomily, "only the physical aspect, or the physical side of death, such as presents itself sometimes to the Christian, without any feeling of inconsistency, and without impairing that hope of future life, which he possesses in a higher degree than [he whom the Preacher represents himself as personating]. We may even say that it is

good for us, occasionally, to fix our minds on this mere physical aspect of our frail humanity.

Oh, when shall spring visit the mouldering ruin?

Oh, when shall day dawn on the night of the grave?

It was not an infidel, but a devout believer, that wrote this. And so, too, there may be at times a sort of melancholy pleasure in thinking of death mainly in its aspect of repose from the toils and anxieties of the present stormy life; as that mournful dirge, so often sung at funerals:

Unveil thy bosom, faithful tomb;
Take this new treasure to thy breast:
And give these sacred relics room
To slumber in thy silent dust.
Nor pains, nor grief, nor anxious fear
Invoke thy bounds; no mortal woes
Can reach the peaceful sleeper here.

We feel no inconsistency between such strains, even when they assume a more sombre aspect, and that brighter view which the Christian takes in contemplating the spiritual side of our strange human destiny ^{**} ↘

And this brighter view is expressly presented in many passages of the Old Testament, particularly in the writings of the Psalmists and the Preacher. For I am a stranger with thee, a sojourner, as all my fathers were" (Psa. xxxix, 12), which means, here, as it did with the ancient patriarchs, that the speaker's face was set toward the better country, and that his citizenship was not on earth, but in heaven. "They that say such things make it manifest that they are seeking after a country of their own"—that is a heavenly (Heb. ix, 14–16). Still more explicit is the language of David in Psa. xvii, 15, "As for me, I shall behold thy face in

*Taylor Lewis, in the Lange Com. on Ecclesiastes.

righteousness; I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." And of Asaph, in Psa. lxxiii, 24, 25, and of David again in Psa. xvi, 9-11. See also Psa. xlix, 15. To say that such expressions as these have no reference to the life beyond the grave is to make them flat and meaningless. "The Psalter glows everywhere with a brightness which nothing could have imparted except a deep presentiment of eternal life." (Binnie). But the Psalms are designed more especially to nurture communion with God in this present life, and, like the Scriptures generally, they presuppose, rather than expressly teach, the doctrine of continued personal existence after death.

§5. *The Inequalities of Human Life.*

In the sacred books, particularly of the period which we are now discussing, this subject, so perplexing to the universal heart of man, is by no means left untouched. We shall briefly consider it here under the two-fold aspect of the prosperity of the wicked and the suffering of the innocent. "The Hebrew mind had never risen to the conception of universal law, but was accustomed to regard all visible phenomena as the immediate result of a free sovereign will. Direct interposition, even arbitrary interference, was no difficulty to the Jew, to whom Jehovah was the absolute sovereign of the world, not acting, so far as he could see, according to any established order." And he had been taught from the very infancy of the nation that Jehovah was not only Sovereign, but that he was also a righteous God, administering the affairs of his moral government according to the principles of immutable justice and righteousness; and this had become his

abiding and one of his cardinal beliefs. But how could he reconcile it with the observed facts of human experience? The wicked prospered; the innocent suffered. This it was that puzzled him.

1. This is the problem raised in Psa. xxxvii—the prosperity of the wicked. Those whom we should expect to receive judgment receive blessing. “Fret not thyself because of him who prospereth in his way, because of the man who bringeth wicked devices to pass;” fret not thyself, for nothing but evil can come of fretting (ver. 7, 8). And the advice given in view of the prosperity of these wicked ones is “to wait;” be not too hasty in forming an estimate of their prosperity; it is only for a brief season; trust in the Lord; look to the end; for soon God will vindicate his righteousness by rewarding the godly and punishing the wicked. But the Psalmist himself seems to have fretted, for the problem was not solved; there was only an appeal to his faith; every seeming mystery will be clearly understood in the end. But the test was severe. “As for me, my feet were almost gone; my steps had well nigh slipped. For I was envious at the arrogant, when I saw the prosperity of the wicked” (Psa. lxxiii, 2 ff.). They are in no seeming peril of death; they are lusty and strong, etc. But, as for me, in vain have I cleansed my heart, and washed my hands in innocence. My righteousness has yielded me no profit. I have been plagued all the day long, and these wicked ones are not plagued at all. As the Psalmist thought upon these things, in order that he might know the mystery, he could not find it. His brain only grew wearier and his heart heavier with pondering. His refuge was in the sanctuary—the

place where God teaches (ver. 17); and there, in some hour of fervent, secret prayer, or perhaps in listening to the chanting of some inspired Psalm, a conviction of the truth broke upon him. He sees the end. The prosperity of the ungodly is clearly shown to be only an appearance. It abides but a little while, vanishing like the fabric of a vision before the terrible reality, when God arises to judgment. "It is made manifest also that it is absurd and unreasonable in the highest degree, for us to allow ourselves to be irritated and deceived by such a show of prosperity. We thus learn, too, that everything depends upon our thus recognizing God as our true and everlasting good, upon our seeking, holding fast to, and proclaiming Him as such. For he whose life is bound up in the Person of the Eternal can never perish, but must only rise from one height to another until he becomes a partaker of the glory of God" (C. B. Moll). But the question, Why should the wicked be so prosperous and happy? is not answered. But the *fact* is shown to be, in the long run, in harmony with the righteousness of God, and thereby its perplexing feature is minimized. The Psalmist is no longer envious, seeing that it is better to be holden by his right hand, and guided by his counsel, and afterwards received into glory, than to be prosperous for a little season.

But a remarkable, if not an unexpected feature of the solution, so far at least as the wicked are concerned, is that their little season of prosperity terminates even before their life in this world. Instead of following them into the next world, as does the parable of our Saviour in the case of Lazarus and the rich man, where we know that all apparent unfairness is ad-

justed, the recompense is seen only on this side of the grave. The Psalmist still occupies the standpoint of the Mosaic doctrine of a retribution to be administered, so far as it is indicated, only in this life. And this was, as yet, according to the design of God, of whose righteousness enough had been revealed in history, or otherwise, to enable his people for the present to take the unknown on faith. After a while, more would be revealed, and yet after a while more *will* be revealed. But here for the present God concealed himself, as in the later parables of the kingdom, in order that he might be found of those who sought him. The sincere seeker could know enough of the mystery of the inequalities of human lot to rest easy in the faith of His righteousness. The wisdom of the Psalmist in fixing his inspired vision on the recompense of the wicked as administered this side of the grave must be apparent.
"That this is so seldom done, even by the well-disposed, that even they are so much inclined to look upon the righteousness of God as inoperative in this life, is a melancholy proof of the degeneracy of the Church, and of the lamentable prevalence of infidelity" (Hengstenberg). God is not unjust in this world that he may be just in the next. He is just now, and hence, is just ever. It is this fact that the Psalmist's solution of the "painful mystery" teaches.

2. But the mystery abides. It is not the wicked and the righteous both who prosper. The righteous suffer. Those who have sinned not; neither their fathers. So at least the sufferer, whose mind was conscious to itself of rectitude, knew; but not such the current opinion; not such was the customary interpretation of the Mosaic doctrine of retribution, to

the unsatisfactory incompleteness of which the faith of some was scarcely equal. And Job was among the number, about whose experience the discussion of the mystery of suffering on the part of the innocent is made to hinge in an elaborate epic-drama, which must be regarded as a classic equal to that of any literature.*

(1.) The scene is laid, in the first place, in the invisible world. Job is represented as being the subject of a conversation between Satan and Jehovah. Satan, in harmony with his name, as the adversary, or accuser, prefers the charge of selfishness against Job. "Does Job fear God for naught?" Any one would serve God as well and faithfully as Job does, if God in turn were to do so well by him. Job is a very rich and happy man. It is easy to be righteous and good when all the temptations are in that direction. Jehovah is represented as denying this charge against her servant Job; and in order that the greater shame

*The uniform use by the author of the book of the name Jehovah, seems to indicate that the book was written by a Hebrew, and at a time when that name had already come into common use in its distinctive sense among the covenant people; but at what time cannot be determined. The fact that other names are uniformly put into the mouths of the *dramatis personæ* is in harmony with the other fact that the scene is laid outside of the sphere of the covenant people both as to their theology and their civilization. It is God in his relation to mankind generally that is presented, though this God is identified by the writer with Jehovah. The thought of the book is distinctively "Hebrew" only in so far as it is the thought of the writer. How far this is the case we may never know, until we have learned to what extent the characters of the book were real persons. These considerations, when elaborated somewhat, seem to render precarious any guess as to the age of the book based on internal evidence.

of defeat may accrue to Satan, and the greater glory to himself and Job, he says, "Try him, and see; do anything to him, however severe, only spare his life." This, then, on its divine side, is the basal thought of the book; the possibility of disinterested service, or, the possibility of faithful service induced by nothing but love. Not often, in the revelation as contained in either Testament, are the gates so far ajar that we may see what is going on, or hear what is being said, in the spirit world. But this is one instance; and perhaps oftener than we are aware are we ourselves the subject of observation or of conversation there.

(2.) But the scene of the drama is changed from the invisible to the visible world. Satan and Jehovah disappear from observation. The *dramatis personæ* are Job and his friends. The scene is in Arabia, at the desolated home of Job—his property all gone, his children all dead, even his wife, with lost integrity, speaking as one of the foolish women, his friends turned into accusers, himself afflicted from head to foot with a loathsome disease, and his bed an ash heap; Job, the one who was regarded as a perfect man and upright, one that feared God and eschewed evil! The basal thought now is, on the human side, "Why do the innocent suffer?"

These two basal thoughts—the one on the divine side, the other on the human—may be united in the one inquiry as to the mystery of suffering. The answer briefly as follows:

1st. *Jehovah's.* To prove to their defamers, whether visible or invisible, the possibility of disinterested love and service, thereby great glory accrues to Jehovah and a great vindication and reward to the sufferers.

This solution restricts the suffering to the innocent, and was not known to Job in the first place.

2d. *Job's*. He cannot answer, but affirms and reaffirms his innocence, and wonders at the mystery.

3d. *Job's Friends'*. They answer substantially by denying that the innocent ever suffer. It is all right. God is just. This is also Elihu's answer. Job has no right to complain. "Why dost thou strive against him? For he giveth not account of any of his matters" (xxxiii, 13). "Far be it from God that he should do wickedness; and from the Almighty that he should commit iniquity. For the work of a man shall he render unto him, and cause every man to find according to his ways" (xxxiv, 10, 11). "But thou hast fulfilled the judgment of the wicked. Judgment and justice take hold on thee" (xxxvi, 17).

The third answer corresponds with the Mosaic, and generally received, doctrine of retribution, in so far as the latter taught that disobedience must be followed by punishment in this life, and in so far as it failed to emphasize that disobedience in this life may be followed by punishment mainly in the future life. As disobedience implied punishment, so punishment implied disobedience, and all suffering was punishment.

The second answer represents a spirit of dissatisfaction with the current doctrine of retribution, not because it did not contain a great truth, but because it did not contain the whole truth. For one class of sufferings, known only to the sufferer, it furnishes no explanation. This remark holds true, whether the Book of Job be regarded as an ante-Mosaic production, or written long after the time of Moses, as it most probably was. One of the earliest religious instincts

of man, or, rather, one that soonest manifests itself, is to associate as cause and effect sin and suffering in this present life. Even the heathen have always been accustomed to say: "We have sinned; therefore the gods are angry with us; therefore this evil has come upon us." Or looking at the evil first: "It argues that we have sinned against the gods, and this in turn argues that they are angry with us." If you sin, you shall be punished in this life. This was not only the Mosaic doctrine of retribution; it had always been, and is yet, the instinctive doctrine of the human heart. "When he giveth quietness, who then can make trouble? and when he hideth his face, who then can behold him? whether it be done against a nation or against a man only" (xxxiv, 29). "He preserveth not the life of the wicked," and those whose life or whose "quietness" he preserveth not are wicked. "Who hath sinned, this man, or his parents, that he should be born blind?" The very anticipation of punishment is punishment. This is one important sense in which the doctrine is always strictly true, no matter when the outward punishment is actually inflicted, though it cannot be said that the forebodings of an evil conscience are dwelt upon in the Hebrew Wisdom books. Moses, as we have seen, emphasized this doctrine of outward punishment in this life, not only because of the truth in it, which ought always to be emphasized, but because a sound judgment as well as Divine guidance enabled him to know that it was the way whereby he could best accomplish the tuition of the Israelites—especially in their national capacity. But, obviously, the common experience and religious consciousness of the Semite, whether Israelite or not,

would at least cause him to suspect that the common doctrine of retribution did not include all sufferings—that there are some sufferings that are not to be regarded as punishments of individual sins, and hence that the righteousness of God needed further vindication.

The first answer, revealed not only in the conversation between Satan and Jehovah in the invisible world, but also in the historical conclusion of the book, classifies and explains these sufferings, so far, at least, as the nature of the case admits. They are not retributive, nor are they disciplinary in the sense of being intended to make the sufferer better. They are what may be called illustrative sufferings, or sufferings for the purpose of object lesson—suffering intended not so much for the sufferer as for others. Or, in other words, still, for the purpose of making evident a truth, the mere statement of which in abstract terms would not be believed, even if it were understood. The abstract truth in this case is the possibility of disinterested love and service of Jehovah. To simply affirm the possibility of it to the accuser, whether in the visible or the invisible world, and to actually illustrate the truth of it in the person or experience of a Job, are two very different things, the latter of which, of course, is far more convincing and therefore more humiliating to the party accusing, and conducive ultimately to the greatest good of the party accused and to the cause to which he belongs.

But while this is the primary teaching of the Book of Job, in regard to the mystery of suffering on the part of the innocent, other great truths in the sphere of theodicy are presented, the substance of which,

briefly stated, is that "the apparently arbitrary distribution of good and evil in this life is not the result of chance or caprice, but that God, the Creator and judge of all, the infinitely wise, holy, just, and good, presides over and controls the affairs of earth, and his providential care extends to all his creatures." It is man's part, often times, to trust rather than to comprehend. Fearing God and keeping his commandments, all will be well.

3. The discussion of the same general theme is continued in Ecclesiastes. Here, however, the writer gives to the discussion a wider range, including within its scope not only the mystery of prosperity and suffering, but all the vanities, vexations, and ceaseless monotonies of human life. And here, as in the Book of Job, the doctrine is to be reached by means of the picture as a whole, the total impression, and not in any separate texts or precepts. The struggle, the doubt, the sentiment, as presented here and there by the characters personated, are necessary to this total effect. What may seem to be its very contradictions, furnish, when rightly viewed, the strongest arguments for the truth ultimately brought out. The author proceeds by a process of exclusion, the source of his argument being represented as his own experience. On the supposition that happiness is to be regarded as man's greatest good, he seeks it first in study, meditating and reasoning deeply upon the actions and lives of men and upon the natural world. He finds himself, however, to be only as one striving after wind. True and enduring happiness eludes him (i, 12-18). Again, the end to be aimed at is regarded as mirth and pleasure (ii, 1-11); and he tries banquets and splendid grounds, all the

arts of luxury, all that wealth could give. This, too, is disappointing. The pleasure lasts only for a moment; laughter becomes madness. Then he tries the pursuit of fame (ii, 12-26). But why should he rack his brain to plan and execute great works, to leave them to unworthy and unappreciative successors? This surely was not what life was for. And when he looks upon life around him, it is all monotony and mystery (iii-viii, 15). In the main, the same events seem to befall all alike. He finds himself dependent upon times, and seasons, and circumstances—a Divine plan which is doubtless good, but which he can neither understand nor change. There are so many oppressed ones without a comforter, all perplexing and baffling; so many evils in social and civil life, which make life only a sore travail. Those who cannot enjoy riches are rich, and those who could are poor. Irreverence, even in the house of God, abounds; as do injustice and violence everywhere. Such is the picture which observation furnishes, in view of which is ours to accept whatever lot is assigned, without fretfulness or impatience, the reason here being the (so far as the writer is permitted to see) changeless and unknown nature of God's plan, which, however, the author believes to be wise and all the Divine work very good; whereas in the Book of Job and in Psalms xxxvii and lxxiii a time is seen in the future when things would not be altogether as they were then.

The Preacher, amid all the perplexing experiences and observations which he describes, amid all the human labors, disappointments and inequalities, yet sees the Hand of a Divine Providence, and though its work be to him now past finding out, the wise man

should not cease to act his proper part in life. Life is not merely a play in which there are tragedies and comedies, and histories and mysteries, and all the players irresponsible. There will be a judgment, and the judge will be just, though the author says not when, nor does he anticipate the nature of the sentence which will be pronounced on this class or that. Watch and wait, and in due time all seeming mystery will be clearly understood. "In short, the author regards as end aim of human life on earth, a joy in the blessings and enjoyments of this world, consecrated by wisdom and the fear of God, with a renunciation of [the hope of] a perfect reconciliation of existing contrasts, difficulties and imperfections, and an eye steadily fixed on the future and universal judgment, as a final solution of all the mysteries of the universe." (Zockler.) Our present and constant disposition should be that of God-fear, and our duty is to faithfully perform the work which devolves upon us.

4. The book of Ecclesiastes, like the book of Job, was not written by an Israelite simply in his capacity of member of the Old Testament form of the Church. It was written rather by a Hebrew, whether Solomon or another, independently of any relation which he may have borne to the theocracy. It was written by a *man* (though inspired), and for *man*, considered as a being under the government of God, and hence as responsible to him. The Hebrew was a man no less truly than he was an Israelite; and being the latter he could not forget that he was also the former. Hence he was obliged to be a philosopher, otherwise he could not have had in him the natural basis of that inspiration which resulted in such productions as the

books of Job, Ecclesiastes, and some of the Psalms. No man can hear unless he listens; no man can see unless he looks; no man can receive answers who does not inquire. The Hebrew listened, and looked, and asked questions, and, like other men, regarded him as fortunate to whom it was supposed to be given to know the mystery of what he is, in his environment, and in his destiny.

The fact that the Hebrew belonged to the Shemitic race may have given a peculiar cast to his philosophy. The theological element was dominant, rather than the logical or psychological. It was theodicy, questions concerning his environment, rather than himself, in the form of drama, or epic-drama, or monologue. The writers of Ecclesiastes and the class to which it belongs, represented not themselves alone. Others thought on the same subjects, and were perplexed, and were comforted. Such writings as these fill a very important place among the recorded revelations of God. If they were not in the Scriptures, their absence would be sadly felt. They are upon subjects about which all men think; beings, a part of whose very nature it is to ask, Why? longing to know "the maze and mystery of things." This part of the recorded revelation appeals to this corresponding part of man's nature. God has heard or anticipated his cry. Man has knocked at the door of the invisible and unknown, and a responding Voice has been heard within. There is a Voice, and hence there must be a Presence; and man does not feel so lonely as he would have felt had he asked and received no answer; had he listened and heard nothing. It may enter into no details. It may be only the pre-Christian version of "What I do thou

knowest not now, but thou shalt understand hereafter" (John viii, 7); but that is much

To the infant crying in the night,
To the infant crying for the light,

such as man is, in his relation to these great mysteries, even only a Voice from within is better than everlasting silence. "Thou shalt understand hereafter." And he who hears the Voice aright goes away from the door of night, and about his daily duties comforted.

These books are commonly supposed to be hard, obscure, and, in some respects, of vague and doubtful teaching; but it is because they are not understood either in themselves or in their relation to God's other revelations, or to the nature of man. The fact that they are in the Bible prevents it from being an essentially incomplete book, and is no small proof that it is from God. But as the Hebrew natural genius was used as the medium of other revelations, so also was it used as the medium of these. The recognition of the human inquiry is the most that is really needed, and it is the most that is given in either the Old or the New Testament revelation—the mere *fact* that there is a certain reality behind the veil, and not an eternal vaccuum, and that after awhile all mysteries will be clearly and satisfactorily understood. For the Bible to say only so much as this is manifestly wiser than would have been an anachronistic attempt at details. Beyond this no information could be given. All the revelation that God has made to man was intended to help him through this life aright, and to this end it is abundantly adequate. No curious information concerning the Divine administration of this or of the unseen world was meant to be given, and if the Bible

had contained such, it could have afforded man no peace, even if it had been believed. Sufficient data for faith is found in the reality of the Presence and in the Voice which he has heard; and nothing can be known beyond faith, until as disembodied spirits we come into contact with the pure spiritual realities. Here we must see in a mirror more or less darkly. And with all these facts the Old and New Testament revelations are in harmony.

CHAPTER IV.

THE DOCTRINAL CONTENTS OF POST-DAVIDIC PROPHECY.

General Remark.

The first, and in some respects the greatest, prophet of this period was Elijah; Samuel come to life again, only in a sterner and intenser type, as the changed character of the times demanded. Like Samuel, he represented in person the Divine judicial power, confronting rebellious king and people, restraining them with fearless and wholesome violence from the abyss into which they were in the act of plunging, and bringing them back yet a little while to the recognition of the one true God. His element was outward action; the reformation of the conduct of a people whose knowledge of truth and right was already far in advance of their morality. It was his mission to enforce into Israel's life the knowledge which had been granted concerning the true God and the right worship of him,

rather than to be the bearer of revelations which had not hitherto been made. He was the John the Baptist of his day, calling Israel to repentance.

In Elisha, on the other hand, "we see the man of God in the main dispensing blessings at a time when the people had repented, and thus in his kindly acts and bearing being in a high degree typical of the Saviour himself, in whom was revealed all the love and grace of God, given to all who trust him in time of need."*

The other prophets, however, whose utterances have been preserved for us in whole books bearing their names, looked with conscious vision beyond the state of their present to the yet greater darkness, or to the rainbow of the future; though, as we have seen, each was influenced in his conceptions both by his own individuality and the general character of the times in which he lived. The central thought of each, however, was the same, viz., "The Kingdom of God as represented in Israel," one viewing it in this aspect and another in that, according to the temperament and character of the prophet, or the circumstances of the times, or the influence which it was desired to have upon the present. One saw it as experiencing judgment on account of sin, another as a remnant emerging from captivity, another as already triumphant and prosperous. One fixed his vision on the members of the kingdom, another on its enemies triumphing for the moment, or already subdued; while another saw the Messianic King himself as Priest atoning for the sins of his people, as a Prophet teaching them, or as Redeemer delivering them, or as Ruler reigning over them in loving sovereignty.

* Orelli, *O. T. Prophecy.*

As we look, therefore, at these aspects of the subject more in detail in the following sections, we shall observe both the wide range of the prophetical teaching of this period, and also the clearer disclosure which it presents of true religion.

§ 1. *The Idea of God in the Prophets.*

1. His being, and His relation to his people.

In the prophets, the two subjects which everywhere meet us are the people and Jehovah their God. "The prophetic teaching," to use the words of Prof. A. B. Davidson, "is not abstract, but consists always of concrete statements regarding these two great subjects and their relations to one another. We cannot, therefore, begin by asking, What is the prophet's doctrine of God? We must inquire what his doctrine in regard to Jehovah the God of Israel is."^{*} And this remark is no less applicable to the prophets in general than to the prophet Amos, whose book, according to the trend of modern opinion, is the earliest of the written prophecies. But the teaching concerning the God of Israel is, after all, the doctrine of the God of the Universe, for, as we shall see, the two are here absolutely identified as the one and only God, as in the former periods of Israel's history.

The distinctive, and numerically the most frequent name by which the Divine Being is known during this period is still the name Jehovah, or Yahveh. In the short book of Amos it occurs no fewer than fifty-two times, in Micah thirty-nine times, and in the still briefer book of Joel thirty-two times. The solemn,

* *Expositor*, March, 1887.

impressive, and characteristic adjunct attached to this name is Sabaoth. It is not found prior to the time of Samuel, but subsequently times without number. He is "Jehovah of Hosts;" or "Jehovah the God of Hosts;" or "Jehovah whose name is God of Hosts;" etc. The origin of this addition to the name is uncertain. Some authorities refer it to the fact that Jehovah was recognized as leader of the hosts or armies of Israel, while others derive it from the stars, which, it is thought, were looked upon as symbolizing the angelic or invisible armies of heaven, all of whom Jehovah could cause to do his bidding, bringing them to the defence of his people and the overthrow of their enemies. In any event, the name was doubtless used to impress the people with the idea of Jehovah's might, he being the one of all others with whom they would best form alliance, and in whom alone they could secure victory and repose. "Lift up your eyes and behold, Who created these things? Who bringeth forth their host by number, and calleth them all by their names? By the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power, not one faileth" (Isa. xl., 26). The name, therefore, is equivalent to the Almighty or Omnipresent One, and in the Septuagint is rightly rendered Pantonkrator. It did not add anything to the people's knowledge of Jehovah, only in so far as it made more vivid and impressive their ancient idea of his almighty power by the employment of a new imagery. As the name was the gradual outgrowth of the circumstances of Israel's political and military history, so in the progress of that history, in the minds of both king and people, it lost to a great extent its solemnity and impressiveness. "Israel doth not know; my people doth

not consider." The name does not occur in Ezekiel, but comes into frequent use again after the captivity.

But while Jehovah, in the prophets, is constantly presented as a national God, or God of the Hebrews, it is only in the sense that he stands in a peculiar, and not in an exclusive, relationship to them. There is but one Elohim, or God, and Jehovah and Elohim are everywhere recognized by the prophets as one Being. There were other gods, so-called, but Jehovah was the only true Elohim. He was the one who governed not only Israel but also the world. His hand appeared throughout nature in all its phases and processes in every part of the universe. As his angry breath withers up Carmel (Amos i, 2), so did he make Orion and the Pleiades (Amos i, 8). All men are also under this government, the destiny of other nations no less than Israel being determined by him. "If I brought Israel up from the land of captivity, did I not also bring the Philistines from Kaptor, and Aram from Kir" (Amos ix, 7). He is everywhere God over the nations, though not the God recognized by the nations. The only Elohim was Jehovah, and Jehovah was this Elohim in his relation to Israel; so that the prophets often speak of him indefinitely by the one name or the other, as had been done by writers of the earliest periods.

2. *His attributes.* The moral attributes of Jehovah, God, are also set forth with distinct and repeated emphasis. He is "The holy one of Israel," an expression which occurs in Isaiah not fewer than thirty times. Holiness is presented as an essential element of the Divine nature. "Jehovah God hath sworn by his holiness," as if he could swear by nothing more inalienable or immutable (Amos x, 2). "And one cried unto

another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is Jehovah of hosts" (Isa. vi, 3). The Divine holiness is presented oftener than any other attribute as the basis of the appeals which the prophets make to Israel to forsake their sins and return unto God. He was of purer eyes than to behold evil, and could not look on iniquity (Hab. i, 13). "Exalt Jehovah our God, and worship at his holy hill; for Jehovah our God is holy" (Psa. xcix, 9). It was another form of the ancient Mosaic teaching. They were Jehovah's, but they could not continue his unless they were like him, but should become to him as the heathen. The relation between himself and his people must be not merely technical or official, but one of "mind to mind, nature to nature." Holiness is also presented as a ground of confidence that if the people would return unto Jehovah they should experience his favor; for as he was holy, so this implied that he must be faithful to his ancient covenant promise. But his faithfulness is also expressly repeatedly declared. "Thou wilt perform the truth to Jacob, and the mercy to Abraham, which thou hast sworn unto our fathers from the days of old" (Micah vii, 20).

His justice, or righteousness, is also clearly depicted, and is not merely to be inferred from his holiness. "The just Lord is in the midst thereof; he will not do iniquity; every morning doth he bring his judgment to light; he faileth not" (Zeph. iii, 15). "Let justice roll down as waters, and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream" (Amos v, 21). As he is, so would he have his people be. "Hate the evil, and love the good" (Amos v, 14).

But while holiness is the attribute of God which is

chiefly emphasized in the prophets, and, indeed, throughout the whole Old Testament, he is also presented as one peculiarly gracious and tender in his relation to his people. "The Lord is good, a stronghold in the day of trouble; and he knoweth them that trust in him" (Nah. i, 7). He pleads with his people, and entreats them to return. "Return, O house of Israel; for while will ye die." "Let him return unto the Lord, and he will abundantly pardon." He grieves because the affections of his people are alienated from him. "I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me." "The ox," even the ox, "knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib; but Israel doth not know, my people doth not consider." He even follows them into exile, and delivers them out of the hand of the terrible (Jer. xv, 21). "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, these may forget, yet will not I forget thee. Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands" (Isa. xl ix, 15, 16).

Nor is his goodness restricted to Israel. He already led the heathen in their wanderings (Amos ix, 7), and the day should come when Israel should be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land; when Jehovah of hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance (Isa. xix, 24, 25.)

§ 2. *Man's Relation to God*

It is indeed Israel whom the prophets for the most part address, and to whom they direct their pleading calls to repentance and reformation of life. But sin is

not regarded by them as a merely national affair, a want of outward conformity to the will of Jehovah, a more or less aggravated type of sedition and treason on the part of a people against their sovereign. It was this, it is true, for all forms of idolatry and witchcraft, or false prophecy, most popular sins, still held their ancient place in the code, and in the recognition of the prophets, as treasonable offences. But it is more than this. The heathen also, who stood in no covenant relation to Jehovah, were sinners against him. Jonah was expressly commissioned to declare this fact to the people of Nineveh, and to command them to repent. The sins of Babylon and the heathen nations generally, which Jehovah regarded as sins against himself, should be the ultimate cause of their destruction. This fact, though recognized, perhaps, in the earlier periods of revelation, is more significant as set forth in the prophets. That those who stood outside of the kingdom of Jehovah should be viewed as sinning against Jehovah and be punished on that account was a fact not so easily grasped as that they should be punished or destroyed because they affected injuriously the welfare of Israel. But however intense the emphasis which the prophets place upon the latter fact, it is obviously true that they also place much upon the former. The heathen could not sin against Jehovah as such, for as such they did not stand in any known relation to him; but they could sin against him as the one and only true God, for as such they stood in relation to him and were amenable to him.

In yet another sense, sin was something more than a mere violation or neglect of outward relations to God.

It was native to the heart, and it was the heart that was desperately diseased (*Jer. xvi, 9*). It was the whole heart that was faint (*Isa. i, 5*). It was in the heart that the idols were taken (*Ezk. xiv, 3*). It was from the heart that falsehoods were uttered, it was the heart that was uncircumcised. And consequently, on the other hand, it is the heart which is constantly represented as needing to be made right before God. It was the heart that should be sent, and not the garments, in token of contrition (*Joel ii, 13*); it was a new heart that must be had before the outward life could be right.

The increased stress placed upon the spirituality of true religion as compared with the apparent recognition of this truth in the Mosaic period is, indeed, one of the chief characteristics of the teachings of the prophets. It is not to be supposed, however, that there is anywhere an antagonism in this respect between the prophets and Moses. The prophets who seem to attach the least importance to the law are simply aiming to bring out more plainly the true meaning of that law. That works without faith, in the sense of inward faithfulness, were valueless, was as true as that faith without works was only a dead profession, and not a living reality. And there were times when it needed to be said over and over again that "the observance of the ceremonial law had no value except as the expression of a godly disposition" or truth in the "inward parts." From the time of Samuel onward this fact was emphasized (*I. Sam. xv, 22*; *Psa. li, 18 f.*; *Amos v, 21*; *Hos. vi, 6*; *Isa. i, 11 f.*, and many other passages). On the contrary, Ezekiel, Daniel and Malachi set a high value on the observance of the Mosaic

law, but for the same reason as the Apostle James insisted upon the necessity of such works as fell within the sphere of the Christian life. As the neglect of the spirit of the Mosaic law is earnestly discouraged by the one class of prophets, so is the reckless disregard of its letter discouraged by the other. The *via media* was the right way in the estimation of both, and in this way both would have Israel walk. The sacrifices of God are, in the first place, a broken spirit; “a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.” These being offered, “Then shalt thou be pleased with the sacrifice of righteousness, with burnt offering and whole burnt offering; then shall they offer bullocks upon thine altar” (*Psa. li, 17, 19*).

The individual Israelite’s hope, therefore, of pardon, or justification, before God, lay in his conscious possession of this godly disposition; or, in other words, his faith. By this he lived (*Hab. ii, 4*). Having this, he gave glory to Jehovah as his sole sovereign (*Jer. xiii, 16*), while on its negative side it manifested itself in quiet and restful confidence (*Isa. xxx, 15*); the faith which in all instances was the basis of the pardon, implying the penitential recognition of one’s self as a sinner before God and dependence upon his mercy alone for forgiveness (*Psa. xxxii, 5*). And this forgiveness of the sinner implied in him all the essentials of the new birth, as set forth in the New Testament, notwithstanding the details of the atonement of Christ were as yet concealed from him. The ground of pardon, however, on the Divine side, was with him as with us, “the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world,” which fact became available to the sinner then, as it does now, by reason of his faith and that which his faith implies.

It was not until Christ came that life was brought to light. And hence the full and conscious condition of permanent sonship toward God was in some respects wanting under the Old Testament dispensation. "The idea of Divine sonship," to quote the words of Oehler, as conferred upon the nation in general, and then upon the theocratic king, nay, as affirmed in a special sense of the godly, was still but an idea, to be fully realized only in the future. The highest communion between God and man established by prophecy, does not attain to the eminence of that filial state inaugurated by the New Testament; for which reason Christ declares the greatest of the prophets to be less than the least in his kingdom" (Matt. xi, 11).

§3. *The Messiah in the Prophets.*

The historical circumstances of Israel are the providential basis of the utterances of the prophets concerning the Messiah. It was national degradation and captivity that made them think of deliverance; and only the darkness could suggest the morning. It was sin that made them realize and voice the need of any expiation. And yet the words of the prophets are by no means the mere expression of the private longing of their own hearts for better things. The expectation of a golden age that should return upon the earth, may have been common in heathen nations; but no heathen prophet in his darkest or his brightest day, ever spoke as the Hebrew prophets spoke, and especially did none ever associate the golden future with the coming of a particular Person, the Messiah. The prophets, in speaking as they did, were the interpreters of the voice of God.

After the close of the Davidic period, which, as we have seen, had been marked by such evident advance in clearness of prophetical utterance, no predictions concerning the Messiah occur until the reign of Uzziah. The new period opens with Joel and Amos. In these and others of the earlier prophets we do not find a distinct reference to the person of the Messiah. The elaborate descriptions which Isaiah and Micah give somewhat later, "do not make the impression on our minds that the idea was a novel one." It would seem, indeed, from the promise made to David (II. Sam. vii, 13; xxiii, 1-5), and from what is said of him in certain of the Davidic Psalms (xlv, lxxii, etc.), that the prevailing conception of the Messiah entertained during the earlier part of the prophetic period may have been that of a king of the house of David who would subdue his enemies and then gather both them and his own people under his peaceful sceptre. It is impossible, however, to trace any chronological progress in the revelation concerning the Messiah, as presented in the writings of the prophets. Each prophet presents him with greater or less degree of clearness in one or more aspects, and only by combining the feature can we obtain the portrait.

1. *His person and nature.* (1) *His Divinity.* Micah, v. 2, is regarded by many interpreters as teaching or declaring his eternity, his "goings forth" from everlasting being contrasted with his "going forth" from Bethlehem. He is represented also in verse 4 of the same chapter, not simply as being sustained by the Divine strength as something objective to him, but as possessing Divine power as his own. Isaiah vii, 14, is generally regarded as referring to the

birth of Immanuel, the personal Messiah. Chapter ix, 6, declares his Divine nature and identity with "the mighty God, the Everlasting Father." In Jer. xxiii, 6, he is called "Jehovah our Righteousness." In ch. xxx, 21, he is described, in terms not applicable to mere man, as being the only one who could approach unto Jehovah.

(2) *His humanity.* He is the "rod out of the stem of Jesse" (Isa. xi, 1); the servant David (Ezek. xxxiv, 24); "the man of sorrows" (Isa. liii, 3).

2. *His office and work.* (1) *King.* He is frequently so presented, as we have seen, in the Psalms. The passages in the prophets are also very numerous, where he is generally David, who hitherto was the Israelite's ideal king. Like David, also, he was to be a descendant of Jesse, and born in Bethlehem, and his kingdom should rise from humble beginnings and proceed to a glorious consummation (Isa. xi, 1; Micah v, 2). The allegory in Ezek. xvii, 22, also refers to Messiah's Kingdom. His royal power was to embrace not Israel alone, but all nations (Isa. xi, 10).

(2) *Priest.* But he was to be a king unlike any other, save Melchizedek, for he should also be a priest, as set forth in the symbolical act described in Zech. vi, 9-15. The double crown unites the royal and priestly functions. He is the guiltless sufferer who by his suffering and death atones for the sins of the people. The sufferings of the Messiah are represented as bringing about the recognition of the God who saves, even among the peoples who had not before known him. All the ends of the earth should remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations should worship before him (Psa. xxii, 27).

The earth should be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea, and there should be none to hurt or destroy in all his holy mountain (Isa xi, 9). This feature of an atoning Messiah is indeed the one above all others which has always most recommended the religion of the Bible to heathen peoples. It is the feast of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees refined, which alone can satisfy the hungry and thirsty (Isa. xxv, 6; Psa. xxii, 26). The whole Old Testament is full of the thought that God stays judgment upon a guilty race on account of a just and righteous sufferer, though it also abundantly teaches that in the case of those enemies of the Messiah, whether of Israel or of the Gentiles, who do not cease to be such and become his willing subjects, this stay of judgment is only temporary. The Messiah thus suffering for others is called the "Servant of Jehovah." "The fundamental conception of the Servant of God in Isa. xli, 8; xlvi, 1, 19; xliv, 1, 21, it is true, is the people of Israel as a whole, including the prophets themselves. But when this servant "is described as the light of the Gentiles (Isa. xlvi, 1-7), the one who shall lead the people back to the Holy Land (Isa. xlix, 1-6, etc.), it is not to be denied that this description refers to an ideal person, and not to the servant of God (Israel) as an aggregate. This must be affirmed very positively of Isa. lii, 13—liii, 12." The prophecy here points to one who evidently does not suffer for his own sins, nor as yet a mere matter of calamity or arbitrary infliction of God. It is an innocent person suffering therefore not for himself, but sinlessly and unselfishly, as a ransom for the sins of others in order that he may procure their justification and peace. This ser-

vant was none other than the son of David, the personal Messiah of the New Testament, who, though despised and rejected of men, was honored of God, and by him raised out of the grave into glory.

3. *Prophet, or teacher.* Moses, as we have seen, predicted that a prophet should be raised up like unto himself, and who should be the mediator between Jehovah and the people, and divinely authorized to be their instructor. In the Messiah of the prophecies of this period does this prediction also find its highest fulfillment. And here again he is spoken of as the chosen Servant on whom Jehovah put his spirit. He should bring forth judgment to the Gentiles, a light to lighten them, as well as the glory of his people Israel. And in all his ministrations as teacher and guide, he should be gentle and tender. “He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench.” And yet the works of his mouth should be to others as a sharp sword. Notwithstanding the humiliation and suffering to which he should be reduced, he should be highly exalted. He should have a prosperous ministry; he should be the great preacher of redemption; he should deliver the captives; he should restore Israel, and bring salvation to the ends of the earth.

§ 4. *The Future.*

The indefinite period of time which lay along the range of prophetic vision is designated by the expression, “the day of Jehovah,” “The day of Jehovah’s anger,” “The great and terrible day of Jehovah;” or

simply "that day," or "the last days." Three groups of events are pointed out.

In the first place, it is a day of judgment upon Israel, a day in which the "lofty looks of man shall be humbled, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and Jehovah alone shall be exalted." See Isa. ii, 11, 17; Joel i, 15; Amos viii, 9-14; Zeph. i, 8-18, and other passages in which Jehovah's own people are addressed. As Israel had long been held up to the heathen world as a proof of how God loves, so also must it bear witness of how he punished even the object of that love, when he impenitently persisted in his sins. The judgments begin with the ten tribes, "the sinful kingdom," which is doomed to destruction from off the face of the earth, because the gradually increasing punishments inflicted upon her had been in vain (Amos iv, 1-13). "And after the catastrophe of Samaria fails to have the effect of leading Judah to repentance, prophecy announces henceforth the ruin of the kingdom of Judah, the destruction of the temple, and the captivity of the people, the locality of which is first designated as Babylon in Micah iv, 10, Isa. xxxiv, 6 f. Judgment being the abrogation of the covenant relation between God and his people, it was inflicted in the form of expulsion from the Holy Land, the abolition of worship by the withdrawal of the shekinah from the desecrated sanctuary, and the cessation of the theocratic government. Israel was to abide many days without a king, without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and to eat polluted bread among the heathen" (Oehler).

In the next place, judgment having begun at the house of God, proceeds to the heathen. "For, lo, I

begin to work evil at the city which is called by my name, and should ye be utterly unpunished? Ye shall not be unpunished, for I will call for a sword upon all the inhabitants of the earth, saith the Lord of hosts" (Jer. xxv, 29. See also the remaining part of the chapter). In general, each prophet sees the judgment upon the heathen according to his own historical circumstances, or the particular character of the events with which he is contemporary. The heathens who are to be overthrown are, from time to time, the Moabites, Edomites, Philistines, Phoenicians, Assyrians, Babylonians, etc., these being, from time to time, the leading enemies of Israel. See Joel iii, 4-19; Isa. xiii-xxiii; Micah v. 6; Nah. i-iii; Zeph. ii, 5-6; Jer. xxv, 12-38; Hab. i, 1-20; Ezek. xxv-xxxii; Zech. xiv, 1-21.

The final overthrow of the enemies of Israel is represented in Joel iii, 12 as taking place in the valley of Jehosaphat, or the Valley of Judgment, near Jerusalem. See also Zech. xiv, 4 f. The fact that the nations are represented as assembled and overthrown in the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem, and the temple indicates, as Hengstenberg and Oehler explain it, that the judgment upon the kingdoms of the world is an outflow of the kingdom of Jehovah and his Anointed. The nations are punished because of their attitude of raging hostility to the Messiah and his people; not on account of their transgression against the natural or unwritten law, "but for the position they occupy toward the covenant people, and consequently toward the God of revelation." The serpent's head is to be crushed by reason of its hostility to him whose heel it had wounded.

The third group of events is the restoration of the penitent and forgiving remnant of Israel to their own land and ancient covenant privileges; to these Jehovah is obliged by his nature as the Holy and gracious One to be faithful and fulfill the “sure mercies” of Abraham and David. The return from Babylon, though to be followed by a yet more calamitous overthrow at the time of the “abomination of desolation” predicted by Daniel, is to the prophet the suggestion of a grander spiritual restoration in the farther future. The prophet sees the time when the spirit shall be poured out in yet more marvellous abundance, and the prophetic gift shall no more be restricted to the few; but the spirit shall be poured out upon all flesh, even the sons and the daughters shall prophecy, the old men shall dream dreams, the young men shall see visions, and upon the servants and handmaids in those days shall the spirit be poured. All the nations shall be Israel, and the Kingdom of Jehovah shall be coextensive with the Kingdom of Elohim, and Messiah the Anointed Son, the Ancient of Days, shall be undisputed King. All the swords and spears, implements of conflict, shall be converted into implements of peaceful husbandry. The eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. The lame man shall leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing. The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad, and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose. The wolf shall lie down with the kid; the calf and the young lion, and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain, for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea. The

capital city of this peaceful and prosperous Messianic kingdom is called Jerusalem, Zion is the source of all legislation and authority, and thither shall all nations and peoples bring their willing offerings. This restoration to renewed vigor, not of the literal Israel, but of Israel as the Church, which the prophets see in the far future, is represented as a resurrection from the dead. After a season of apparent destruction it should live again in his sight (*Hos. vi, 2*). He would swallow up death in victory, and wipe away tears from off all faces (*Isa. xxv, 8*). Ezekiel's vision of the resurrection of the dry bones in the valley is a vision of the church's rising to newness of life. "Then said he unto me, Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel . . . and shall put my spirit in you, and ye shall live, and I shall place you in your own land; then shall ye know that I the Lord have spoken it, and performed, saith the Lord" (*Ezek. xxxvii, 1-15*).

In profound gaze the prophets saw that the then present form of the theocracy "must be dissolved in judgment and the nation pass through the ordeal of death before God's true kingdom could find place." But they also saw that, one day, the right attitude of heart to Him being present, He would be to it as the fertilizing dew is to the herb, breathing into it new life, and making it "fair as the lily and firm as Lebanon." The prophecy was fulfilled in small part in the return from the Chaldean exile, in yet larger part when Christ came, while the time when the fulfillment shall be filled full is yet in daily process of coming. On

which point of the long line of prophetic gaze the prophet fixed his vision most we cannot say; but the Spirit we think meant the New Testament spiritual dispensation of the Church, and the grand consummation at the end. As for the Israelite of those days, he doubtless saw most distinctly that end of the prophetic line of vision which was nearest him and was the least spiritual. And by so much as this he was helped on.

§ 5. *Individual Resurrection.*

But was the resurrection and the perpetuity of the Church all that the prophets saw? What of the individual? While the tree should spring up from the decayed stock and abide evermore, should the individual twigs one by one perish forever?

The Israelites, as we have seen, through all their history, believed in the doctrine of the soul's immortality; but did they also believe in the resurrection of body? The question must evidently be answered in the affirmative; though the New Testament view of this subject is not emphasized in the Old, but is rather quietly assumed. Resurrection and immortality were more nearly identical in the old Israelitish thought. But they were not wholly so. The fact of a future restoration of the Church from a state of death could scarcely have been presented under the symbolism of a dead body raised to life from the grave, had not the idea of such resurrection been a familiar one both to the prophetic and the common mind. It was very much as if the prophet had said, As there shall one day be a resurrection of the bodies of the individual members, so shall the aggregate church one day arise from its state of decay and death; nor do the prophets any

where use language that would seem to imply that the former idea was a novel one; and we know that the belief in this doctrine by the Pharisees of a later period must have been an inheritance, and not the outgrowth of contemporary inspired teaching.

But the prophets have not left us without express utterance on this subject. In Isa. xxvi, 19, the reference is not to the resurrection of the church as a whole simply, but to that of the individual. It is the church who is addressed, and her dead ones are called "my," that is, God's dead ones, because they sleep in him. "Thy dead ones shall live; my dead bodies shall arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust, for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast forth the dead." The energy which proceeds from God, causing the earth to give forth its dead, is compared in its quickening effect and heavenly origin to the dew. The dead are the seed planted, and his dew shall cause them to rise again.

On the contrary, in Isa. xxv, 8, and Hos. xiii, 14, it is the state of the church as a whole which the prophets have in mind,—not the fact of resurrection, either of it or of the body, but the future good time when there should be no more death, and the tears should be wiped from all faces. But the resurrection of the individual dead is again explicitly taught in Dan. xii. Many—or *the* many, as contrasted with those who are alive at the time of the end, and shall not see death—"the many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that be wise," whether of the risen or of those who had not died, "shall shine as the brightness of the firmament,

and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever" (ver. 2, 3). The prophet sees not only the two-fold resurrection of both the just and the unjust, but also the general judgment and the whole future thereafter. "Behold, I create new heavens, and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered nor come unto mind" (Isa. lxv, 17).

§6. *The Old Testament Doctrine of Angels.*

The word usually employed in the Old Testament to designate these beings is *malach*, a word which has reference to their office as agents, or messengers, rather than to their nature. Sometimes they are spoken of simply as spirits, whether good or evil. It is not the province either of the Old or of the New Testament to reveal to us the mysteries, whether of being or of deed of the spirit world, only in so far as glimpses of these mysteries immediately pertain to our welfare as spiritual and immortal beings ourselves. Such knowledge is not for the present regarded as an end in itself, and hence it is revealed to us only meagerly and exclusively in its practical bearings. Yet of the numerous instances in which they are mentioned, there is no instance in which they are spoken of as if the idea was a novel one to the people. They appear for the first time in the Old Testament as far back as the early patriarchal times (Gen. xvi, 7), and at intervals continuously thereafter until the very close of the Old Testament period. Job, in ch. xxxviii, 7, even associates them under the name of "sons of God," with the time when the foundations of the earth were laid, and represents them as rejoicing with other "morning stars."

They are represented as spirits, both good and evil, and possessed of power to occupy man (*I. Sam.* xviii, 10; *I. Chron.* xxi, 1). They are not expressly said in the Old Testament to be created and finite beings, but this is everywhere implied, as well as that they are of the same nature, differing only in degree, as man himself. They are spoken of uniformly as God's angels, or as Jehovah's angels, and he is so infinitely above them as to be represented as charging even his angels with folly (*Job.* iv, 18).

As to their office but little is revealed of them apart from their relation to man. In *I. Kings* xxii, 19, the prophet sees the Lord sitting on his throne and all the hosts of heaven standing by him on his right hand and on his left; so also in *Isa.* vi, 1-3, and *Dan.* vii, 9, 10, when an innumerable multitude are engaged in his unceasing adoration.

In their relation to man we know more of them. They are represented in numberless passages from the earliest to the latest books, as being the agents of God's Providence, both to the soul and to the body, to the individual and to his people as a whole. They work within the sphere of natural law, and are also particularly represented as working in the sphere of the supernatural.

During, and subsequently to, the period of the captivity, angels are revealed to Daniel and Zechariah in a hitherto unrecognized light, as watching, not only over Jerusalem, but also over heathen kingdoms to work out the providential designs of God.

The Israelites had from the earliest period of their existence been too accustomed to the belief in the existence of angels and of their relation to man, to justify

us in supposing for a moment that any part of the idea was borrowed by the later prophets from the Persians or other heathen. Although the office of the angels is presented in a new light in the prophets of the captivity as being the guardians of Israel and other nations, it was only because the changed circumstances of God's people rendered possible and expedient a new and further revelation on this subject. That the angelic doctrine, however, of Daniel and Zechariah is an out and out importation from the Persians, can never be proved.

The doctrine of Satan, or evil angels of any order, scarcely appears in the prophets; though this silence is not to be construed as arguing a disbelief in the existence of such spirits. As we have said in regard to the resurrection, so may it here be said, that the belief in the existence of Satan and lower demons, as it appears among the Jews of the New Testament time, cannot be regarded as of recent origin, but was rather an inheritance from the times past. See Zech. iii, 1, in which passage "Satan" cannot be regarded as other than the angelic and superhuman antithesis of the "Angel of the Lord," and not, as some have supposed, as the mere human accuser of Joshua and the Jewish people at the Persian court.

INDEX.

PAGE.	PAGE.
Aaron.....111, 134, 242	Ceremonial Law, The.....23
Abraham....79, 89, 93, 98, 102, 105, 122, 204, 206	Chedorlaomer.....74
Abraham, Seed of.....106	Chaldea70, 80, 90
Accad	Chaldean Tablets.....55
Adam.....266	Church, Identity of.....41
"Adam" and "Ish".....166	Church and State.....95, 195
Adonay.....128	Children.....223
Adultery.....223	Christian Dogmatics.....14
Ahab	Circumcision.....102
Altar, Ritual of.....245	Civilization.....227
Angels.....149, 161	Civil Code.....223
Antediluvians.....81	Coccejus.....22
Anthropology, Mosaic.....153	Cosmogony, Egyptian.....121
Anthropomorphites	Constitutional Law, The Mo- saic
Apochryphal Writings.....16218
Aryan Traditions.....59	Covenant, The.....93, 96, 101, 104
Arphaxad	Crimianl Code.....233
Assyrians	Creation
Assyrian Inscriptions.....7352, 141
Assyrian Hierarchy.....56	Curse, the Chaldean Account of
Atonement.....23460
Bacon, Roger.....19	Cushites, The.....74
Babel.....76	"Cut off" from the People.....234
Babylonian Captivity.....142	Davidic Theology, The.....313
Baring-Gould.....159	Davidson
Balak.....250	Death.....187
Balaam, Prophecy of.....250	Deluge, Pre-Mosaic Tra- ditions of
Betrothal.....22563
Bible	Delitzsch.....86, 116, 167, 173, 190
Biblical Theology.....11	Difference between the Testa- ments
Bloody Sacrifices.....10036
Body, Soul, Spirit.....170	Divine Unity, The.....128
Briggs.....297	Divine Faithfulness
Calf-worship138
Calling of Israel.....207	Divine Justice.....140, 245
Cainites.....86	Divine Sovereignty
Calneh.....76141, 208
Canaan.....70, 105, 203	Divine Self-revelation
Canaanitish Tribes.....71, 261146
Calvin	Divine Face, The
Capital Punishment.....42148
	Divine Purity, Idea of
244
	Divinity, Sight of
153
	Divorce
225
	Disobedience
233
	Doctrine of God.....88, 114, 123, 164
	Dogmatic Exegesis.....21

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Dreams.....	162	Image Worship.....	133
Earth, Population of.....	72	Individualism.....	26
Ebionites.....	41	Isaac.....	102, 106, 204
Ecclesiastes.....	312	Israel, Call of.....	207
Edersheim.....	179	Israel, Kingdom of Priests.....	210
Egyptians, Religious State of.....	90	Israel, Jehovah's Property.....	209
Elamites.....	76	Israel, Government of.....	214
Election of Israel.....	207	Ishmael.....	205
Elijah and Elisha.....	265	"Ish".....	166
El, Eloah, etc.....	114, 117	Jacob.....	102, 106, 204
Elohim.....	82, 84, 85, 105, 114, 118, 121, 127, 143, 163, 203	Jahn.....	234
Eldest Son.....	230	Japheth.....	69, 203
Enoch.....	84, 85, 266	Jehovah.....	82, 114, 123, 129, 204, 208, 252, 314
Entail of Land.....	280	Jehovah Sabaoth.....	127
Erasmus.....	21	Jeremiah.....	269, 276, 277
Erech.....	76	Jewish Theology.....	177
Esau.....	107, 205	Job.....	312
Ethiopians.....	109	Joshua.....	261
Excommunication.....	234	Josephus.....	112, 195
Exodus.....	12	Jubilee, The.....	230
Fall, The.....	175	Judicial System, The Mosaic.....	221
Fall, Traditions of the.....	59	Justice, Legislative and Judicial.....	140
Face, The Divine.....	148	Judges, Office of.....	262
Flatt.....	24	Judges, Times of.....	261
Foreigners.....	229	Kings, Order of.....	256
"Form" of God.....	165	Kingdom of God.....	195
Francke.....	223	Knapp.....	24
Future Life.....	89, 189	Kurtz.....	126
Genesis.....	12, 54	Land Laws.....	229
Gesenius.....	149	Lamech.....	85, 86
Greek Fathers.....	149	Languages, Divergencies of.....	71
Ham.....	69, 203	Lenormant.....	64
Haupt.....	64	Levirate Marriage.....	226
Hebrew Learning.....	19	Levites.....	236
Hebrew Language.....	121, 156	Lewis, Dr. Tayler.....	192
Hebrew Theology.....	216	Lord's Supper, The.....	39
Hengstenberg.....	24, 140	Lyra, Nicholas.....	20
Herodotus.....	77	Magistrates, Number of.....	221
Hesiod.....	61	Man, Primeval.....	59
High Priest, Attire of.....	238	Man, Mosaic Doctrine of.....	153
High Places.....	264	Manichæans.....	42
History, a Revelation.....	30	Mantism.....	278
Hittites, The.....	73	Malakh, The.....	148
Hittite Inscription.....	73	Marriages, Levirate.....	226
Hodge.....	149	Marriage Laws.....	223
Holiness.....	135	McLaren.....	98
Human Race, Unity of.....	154, 160	Master and Slave.....	227
"Ideal Man," The.....	311	Memorial Value of Types The.....	248
Idolatry.....	262, 264		
Identity of the Testaments...	37		

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Melanchthon.....	42, 43	Prophetism.....	186
Messiah, The.....	105, 203, 254, 258, 282, 293, 296, 298, 305	Prophetic Gift.....	275
Melchizedec.....	116	Prophecy, Nature of	275
Milman.....	98	Prophecy of Balaam.....	250
Miracles.....	150	Prophecy, Rise of	263, 266
Michaelis.....	234	Prophecy, its Practical Char- acter.....	288
Monarchy, Establishment of	263	Prophecy, its Moral Charac- ter.....	289
Monotheism	88, 120, 265, 313	Prophecy, its Evangelical	290
Montanism.....	297	Prophecy, its Predictive Ele- ment.....	285
Mohamed.....	283	Prophecy, its Grouping Events.....	291
Moses.....	54, 108, 122, 151, 221	Prophecy, its Time Element.....	290
Mosaic Judicial System.....	219	Prophecy, its Dependence upon History.....	293
Mosaic "Types".....	241	Prophecy, Realization of	295
Mosaism.....	104, 146	Prophecy, Apparent Contra- dictions.....	296
Murphy on Genesis.....	160	Prophecy, Forms of	296
Mughier.....	80	Prophecy, Rationalistic The- ory of	297
Nabi.....	266, 278, 285	Prophecy, Montanistic The- ory of	297
Nature Worship.....	261	Prophecy, Periods of	272
Nations, Dispersion of	69	Prophet, The Promised.....	255
Name, The Ineffable.....	129	Prophets, False.....	269, 276
Name, The Divine.....	147, 314	Prophets, Number and Influ- ence of	265
Nephilim, The.....	89	Priests.....	238
Nimrod.....	75	Priests, Order of	256
Noah.....	91	Property.....	229
Obadiah.....	269	Protestantism.....	25, 26
Obligations.....	211	Providence.....	143, 315
Oehler.....	50, 116, 149, 175	Proverbs.....	312
Offences.....	233	Protevangelium.....	189
Offerings.....	243	Psychology, Biblical	169
Oosterzee.....	24	Race.....	159
Orelli.....	273, 283, 297	Rawlinson.....	77
Pantheism.....	42	Rationalism	22, 24
Parents.....	223	Redemption	12, 38, 195, 204
Passion Psalms, The	308	Redemption Money.....	232
Patriarchs Theology of.....	88	Reuchlin.....	21
Patriarchs Blessing of	205	Reformation.....	20
Pentateuch, Age of.....	193	Regal Psalms, The	305
Perowne.....	307	Revelation.....	27, 47, 146, 181
People, Guilt of	245	Revelation, Biblical	31, 120
Penalties.....	211, 246	"Records of the Past"	53
Pietism.....	22, 23	Retribution.....	212, 289
Philistines.....	72	Ritual of the Altar.....	24
Phoenicians	72		
Physicians.....	268		
Physical Evil.....	145		
Polygamy	103, 227		
Polytheism.....	88, 129, 162		
Promise to Patriarchs.....	205		
Proper Names.....	115		
Probation.....	175		

PAGE.	PAGE.
Revival of Learning.....	19
Roman Catholicism.....	25, 26
"Sacred Books".....	33
Samuel.....	263, 268
Salvation.....	40, 92
Sacrifices.....	92, 99
Satan, Doctrine of.....	180, 199
Sayce	71
Semitic Languages.....	118
Semitic Heathen.....	119
Semler	24
Servitude in Egypt.....	107
Septuagint Version.....	84, 117
Sethites.....	85
Self-revelation of God.....	146
Sex.....	156
Schools of the Prophets.....	263
Schleiermacher	24
Shamanism.....	279, 284
Shemitic Genius.....	283
Shem.....	69, 201, 203
Shekinah.....	149
Sinai	132
Sin	183
Slaves.....	227
Song of Songs.....	312
Sonship.....	208
Spener	22
Spirituality of God.....	133
"Spirit of God".....	151
State-Church.....	195
Star of Balaam.....	250
Stanley.....	119, 129
Steudej	24
Storr.....	24
Strangers.....	229
Symbols.....	297
Systematic Theology.....	14, 15
Tabernacle, The.....	236
Teachers.....	268
Ten Commandments, The.....	219
Tax-laws.....	231
Terah.....	75, 81
Tithes.....	231
Tertullian.....	165
Testaments, The.....	35
Title of Bible	11
Theft.....	233
Theocracy, The.....	195, 214
Thouck.....	24
Tongues, Confusion of.....	75
Tree of Knowledge.....	177
Tree of Life	181
Trench, Archbishop.....	43
Trinity, The.....	162
Trichotomy	170
Types	241, 297
Unchastity Punished.....	233
Urim and Thummim.....	278, 279
Ur	80
Van Til	272
Visions	153
Vulgata, The.....	117, 200
"Wisdom," The Hebrew.....	50, 312
Worship, The Patriarchal.....	89
Wright's Hittite Empire.....	74
Zendavesta	17

REFERENCE BOOKS FOR BIBLE STUDENTS.

JAMIESON, FAUSSET & BROWN'S Popular Portable Commentary. Critical, Practical, Explanatory. Four volumes in neat box, fine cloth, \$8.00; half bound, \$10.00.

A new edition, containing the complete unabridged notes in clear type on good paper, in four handsome 12 mo. volumes of about 1,000 pages each, with copious index, numerous illustrations and maps, and a Bible Dictionary compiled from Dr. Wm. Smith's standard work.

Bishop Vincent of Chautauqua fame says: "The best condensed commentary on the whole Bible is Jamieson, Fausset & Brown."

CRUDEN'S UNABRIDGED CONCORDANCE TO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. With life of the author. 864 pp., 8vo., cloth (net), \$1.00; half roan, sprinkled edges (net), 2.00; half roan, full gilt edges (net), \$2.50.

SMITH'S BIBLE DICTIONARY, comprising its Antiquities, Biography, Geography and Natural History, with numerous maps and illustrations. Edited and condensed from his great work by WILLIAM SMITH, LL. D. 776 pages, 8vo, many illustrations, cloth, \$1.50.

THE BIBLE TEXT CYCLOPEDIA. A complete classification of Scripture Texts in the form of an alphabetical list of subjects. By Rev. JAMES INGLIS. Large 8vo, 524 pages, cloth, \$1.75.

The plan is much the same as the "Bible Text Book" with the valuable additional help in that the texts referred to are quoted in full. Thus the student is saved the time and labor of turning to numerous passages, which, when found, may not be pertinent to the subject he has in hand.

THE TREASURY OF SCRIPTURE KNOWLEDGE; consisting of 500,000 scripture references and parallel passages, with numerous notes. 8vo, 778 pages, cloth, \$2.00.

A single examination of this remarkable compilation of references will convince the reader of the fact that "the Bible is its own best interpreter."

THE WORKS OF FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, translated by WILLIAM WHISTON, A. M., with Life, Portrait, Notes and Index. A new cheap edition in clear type. Large 8vo, 684 pages, cloth, \$2.00.

100,000 SYNONYMS AND ANTONYMS. By Rt. Rev. SAMUEL FALLOWS, A. M., D. D. 512 pages, cloth, \$1.00.

A complete Dictionary of synonyms and words of opposite meanings, with an appendix of Criticisms, Americanisms, Colloquialisms, Homonyms, Homophonous words, Foreign Phrases, etc., etc.

"This is one of the best books of its kind we have seen, and probably there is nothing published in the country that is equal to it."—*Y. M. C. A. Watchman*.

NEW YORK:
12 Bible House, Astor Pl.

Fleming H. Revell

CHICAGO:
148 & 150 Madison St

REFERENCE BOOKS FOR BIBLE STUDENTS.

JAMIESON, FAUSSET & BROWN'S Popular Portable Commentary. Critical, Practical, Explanatory. Four volumes in neat box, fine cloth, \$8.00; half bound, \$10.00.

A new edition, containing the complete unabridged notes in clear type on good paper, in four handsome 12 mo. volumes of about 1,000 pages each, with copious index, numerous illustrations and maps, and a Bible Dictionary compiled from Dr. Wm. Smith's standard work.

Bishop Vincent of Chautauqua fame says: "The best condensed commentary on the whole Bible is Jamieson, Fausset & Brown."

CRUDEN'S UNABRIDGED CONCORDANCE TO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. With life of the author. 864 pp., 8vo., cloth (net), \$1.00; half roan, sprinkled edges (net), 2.00; half roan, full gilt edges (net), \$2.50. Postage extra, 20c.

SMITH'S BIBLE DICTIONARY, comprising its Antiquities, Biography, Geography and Natural History, with numerous maps and illustrations. Edited and condensed from his great work by WILLIAM SMITH, LL. D. 776 pages, 8vo, many illustrations, cloth, \$1.50.

THE BIBLE TEXT CYCLOPEDIA. A complete classification of Scripture Texts in the form of an alphabetical list of subjects. By Rev. JAMES INGLIS. Large 8vo, 524 pages, cloth, \$1.75.

In studying a Bible lesson, in arranging a Bible reading, a concert exercise, or an opening and closing service for the Sunday school; in preparing a sermon, or in searching out any theme of Christian thought or study, we have found this book of pre-eminent value as a help to a thorough and intelligent acquaintance with the declarations of the sacred text in the subject under consideration. We know of no other work comparable to it in this department of study.—*S. S. Times*,

THE TREASURY OF SCRIPTURE KNOWLEDGE; consisting of 500,000 scripture references and parallel passages, with numerous notes. 8vo, 778 pages. cloth, \$2.00.

A single examination of this remarkable compilation of references will convince the reader of the fact that "the Bible is its own best interpreter."

THE WORKS OF FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, translated by WILLIAM WHISTON, A. M., with Life, Portrait, Notes and Index. A new cheap edition in clear type. Large 8vo, 684 pages, cloth, \$2.00.

100,000 SYNONYMS AND ANTONYMS. By Rt. Rev. SAMUEL FALLOWS, A. M., D. D. 512 pages, cloth, \$1.00.

A complete Dictionary of synonyms and words of opposite meanings, with an appendix of Briticisms, Americanisms, Colloquialisms, Homonims, Homophonous words, Foreign Phrases, etc., etc.

"This is one of the best books of its kind we have seen, and probably there is nothing published in the country that is equal to it."—*Y. M. C. A. Watchman*.

NEW YORK:
12 Bible House, Astor Pl.

Fleming H. Revell

CHICAGO:
148 & 150 Madison St.

SUGGESTIVE BOOKS --

-- FOR BIBLE READERS.

NEW NOTES FOR BIBLE READINGS. By the late S. R. BRIGGS, with brief Memoir of the author by Rev. JAS. H. BROOKES, D. D., Crown 8vo, cloth, \$1.00; flexible, 75 cents.

"New Notes" is not a reprint, and contains *Bible Readings* to be found in no other similar work, and, it is confidently believed, will be found more carefully prepared, and therefore more helpful and suggestive.

Everyone of the 60,000 readers of "Notes and Suggestions for Bible Readings" will welcome this entirely new collection containing selections from D. L. Moody, Major Whittle, J. H. Brookes, D. D., Prof. W. G. Moorehead, Rev. E. P. Marvin, Jno. Currie, Rev. W. J. Erdman, Rev. F. E. Marsh, Dr. L. W. Munhall, etc.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS FOR BIBLE READINGS. By S. R. BRIGGS and J. H. ELLIOTT.

Containing, in addition to twelve introductory chapters on plans and method of Bible study and Bible readings, over six hundred outlines of Bible readings, by many of the most eminent Bible students of the day. Crown 8vo, 262 pp. Cloth, library style, \$1.00; flexible cloth, .75; paper covers, .50.

THE OPEN SECRET; or, The Bible Explaining Itself. A series of intensely practical Bible readings. By HANNAH WHITALL SMITH. 320 pp. Fine cloth, \$1.00.

That the author of this work has a faculty of presenting the "Secret Things" that are revealed in the Word of God is apparent to all who have read the exceedingly popular work, "The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life."

BIBLE BRIEFS; or, Outline Themes for Scripture Students. By G. C. & E. A. NEEDHAM. 16mo., 224 pages, cloth, \$1.00.

The plan of these expositions is suggestive rather than exhaustive, and these suggestions are designed to aid Evangelists at home and missionaries abroad, Bible School Teachers, and Christian Association Secretaries and Workers.

BIBLE HELPS FOR BUSY MEN. By A. C. P. COOTE.

Contains over 200 Scripture subjects, clearly worked out and printed in good legible type, with an alphabetical index. 140 pages, 16mo.; paper, 40c.; cloth flex., 60c.

"Likely to be of use to overworked brethren."—C. H. SPURGEON.

"Given in a clear and remarkably telling form."—*Christian Leader*.

RUTH, THE MOABITESS; or Gleaning in the Book of Ruth. By HENRY MOORHOUSE. 16mo., paper covers, 20c.; cloth, 40c.

A characteristic series of Bible readings, full of suggestion and instruction.

BIBLE READINGS. By HENRY MOORHOUSE. 16mo., paper covers, 30 cents; cloth, 60 cents.

A series by one pre-eminently the man of one book, an incessant, intense, prayerful student of the Bible.

SYMBOLS AND SYSTEMS IN BIBLE READINGS.

Rev. W. F. CRAFTS. 64 pages and cover, 25 cents.

Giving a plan of Bible reading, with fifty verses definitely assigned for each day, the Bible being arranged in the order of its events. The entire symbolism of the Biblical explained concisely and clearly.

NEW YORK:
12 Bible House, Astor Pl.

Fleming H. Revell

CHICAGO:
148 & 150 Madison St.

◇HAND BOOKS FOR BIBLE STUDENTS◇

THE LIFE OF CHRIST. Rev. JAS. STALKER, M. A. A new edition, with introduction by Rev. GEO. C. LORIMER, D. D. 12mo. cloth, 166 pages, 60 cents.

This work is in truth "*Multum in Parvo*," containing within small compass a vast amount of most helpful teaching, so admirably arranged that the reader gathers with remarkable definiteness the whole revealed record of the life work of our Lord in a nutshell of space and with a minimum of study.

THE LIFE OF ST. PAUL. By Rev. JAS. STALKER, M. A. 12mo. cloth, 184 pages, 60 cents.

As admirable a work as the exceedingly popular volume by this author on "The Life of Christ."

"An exceedingly compact life of the Apostle to the Gentiles. It is bristling with information, and is brief, yet clear. As an outline of Paul's life it cannot be surpassed."—*N. Y. Christian Inquirer.*

THE BIBLE STUDENTS' HANDBOOK. 12mo cloth, 288 pages, 50 cents.

One of those helpful works, worth its price, multiplied by several scores. It contains an introduction to the study of the Scriptures, with a brief account of the books of the Bible, their writers, etc., also a synopsis of the life and work of our Lord, and complete history of the manners and customs of the times, etc.

THE TOPICAL TEXT BOOK. 16mo. cloth, 292 pages, 60 cents.

A remarkably complete and helpful Scripture text book for the topical study of the Bible. Useful in preparing Bible readings, addresses, etc.

THE BIBLE REMEMBRANCER. 24mo. cloth, 198 pages, 50 cts.

A complete analyses of the Bible is here given, in small compass, in addition to a large amount of valuable Biblical information, and twelve colored maps.

BIBLE LESSONS ON JOSHUA AND JUDGES. By Rev. J. GURNEY HOARE, M. A. 16mo cloth, 124 pages, 50 cents.

FIFTY-TWO LESSONS ON (1) The Works of Our Lord; (2) Claims of Our Lord. Forming a year's course of instruction for Bible classes, Sunday schools and lectures. By FLAVEL S. COOK, M. A., D. D. 16mo. cloth, 104 pages, 50 cents.

FIFTY-TWO LESSONS ON (1) The Names and Titles of Our Lord; (2) Prophesies Concerning Our Lord and their Fulfillment. By FLAVEL S. COOK, M. A., D. D. 16mo. cloth, 104 pages, 50 cents.

Extremely full in the matter of reference and explanation, and likely to make the user "search the Scriptures."

OUTLINE OF THE BOOKS OF THE BIBLE. By Rev. J. H. BROOKES, D. D. Invaluable to the young student of the Bible as a "First Lesson" in the study of the Book. 180 pages. Cloth, 50 cents; paper covers, 25 cents.

CHRIST AND THE SCRIPTURES. By Rev. ADOLPH SAPHER. 16mo. cloth, 160 pages, 75 cents.

To all disciples of Christ this work commends itself at once by its grasp of truth, its insight, the life in it, and its spiritual force.—*Christian Work.*

NEW YORK:
12 Bible House, Astor Pl.

Fleming H. Revell

CHICAGO:
148 & 150 Madison St.

The "Northfield Books."

A COLLEGE OF COLLEGES—89. (Third vol. of this series). Uniform with former volumes, and containing studies and talks by Bishops Baldwin and Foss, Prof. Harper, Rev. Drs. Hodge, Driver, Pearson, Mr. Moody and others. 288 pp., \$1.00.

COLLEGE STUDENTS AT NORTHFIELD; or, A College of Colleges, No. 2. Conducted during July, 1888: Containing addresses by Mr. D. L. Moody, Rev. J. Hudson Taylor, M. D., Bishop Hendrix, Rev. Alex. McKenzie, D.D., Rev. Henry Clay Trumbull, D. D., Prof. W. B. Harper, and others. 12mo, 296 pp., cloth, \$1.00 net.

The "Practical Talks" as given in report of last year's gathering, the demand for which has called for a seventh edition, has induced us to publish an account of this year's proceedings, none the less "practical," and we feel sure will be as fully appreciated.

Dr. A. T. Pierson writes: "Admirable book. I deem it one of the best of all the practical helps issued by the press."

Dr. Joseph Cook.—"It is well edited, well printed, and well inspired from on High. Is full of a Holy Fire of spiritual zeal, which I hope to see spread far and wide."

President M. E. Gates, of Rutgers College, writes: "The influence which has gone out on the College Life of this country, from the summer meetings at Northfield, is so potent for good, that I welcome the extension and perpetuation of that influence through this book."

SEVENTH THOUSAND.

A COLLEGE OF COLLEGES; or, Practical Talks to College Students. Given in July, 1887, by Prof. Henry Drummond, F.R.S.S., Rev. J. A. Broadus, D.D., Prof. Townsend, Rev. A. T. Pierson, D.D., Mr. D. L. Moody, and others. 12mo, 288 pp., cloth, \$1.00 net.

"Of signal value."—*Chautauqua Herald*.

"We commend this volume very cordially."—*Presbyterian Witness*.

"The volume closes with a chapter of 'nuggets' from Northfield, which is no exception, however, as the other chapters are equally rich in 'nuggets.'"—*The Independent*.

D. L. MOODY AT HOME. His Home and Home Work.

Embracing a description of the educational institutions established at Northfield, Mass., together with an account of the various noted gatherings of Christian workers at the place, and the most helpful and suggestive lectures, and the best thoughts there exchanged; adding, also, many helpful and practical results. 288 pp., clo., 8 illustrations, \$1.00.

The New York *Independent* says: "There is nothing in the career of this remarkable man more striking than his work at Northfield."

The New York *Evangelist* spoke most truly when it said: "The public is unaware of Mr. Moody's enormous investments at Northfield, that will pay him abundant interest long after he reaches heaven."

NEW YORK:
12 Bible House, Astor Pl.

Fleming H. Revell

CHICAGO:
148 & 150 Madison St.

221.61

67-2609

F816o

Attr: Foster, R.V.

i Old Testament studies: an
c outline of Old Testament
Societ theologywill fin
less vi

Child

APR 2

F

221.61

F816o

67-2609

part of
work

among

school

plans

contrib

Clear

S

done in

speciall

The C

Talks

R

which
tory in

imagin

"

of this

Centri

to par

Short

E

counte

plain

by the

Conv

r

I

Your

l

ing C

might

"Our

N

2 Bi

DATE DUE

AUTHOR Old Testament studies: an

TITLE outline of Old Testament
theology

DATE DUE

BORROWER'S NAME

APR 27 1988

Wayne Huffeling

MYO 9 '95

RAMSEY RABIE 476

THE MASTER'S COLLEGE
POWELL LIBRARY
SANTA CLARITA, CA 91321

F7560

~~67-2609~~

09



THE MASTER'S COLLEGE

221.61 F816o

MAIN

Foster, R. V./Old Testament studies: an



3 3540 00001 9636